

Les deux noms de Jérusalem dans les Actes des Apôtres

Introduction

1. Dès le second siècle, les commentateurs ont remarqué que Jérusalem, dans le NT, est désignée sous deux noms différents: Ἱερουσαλήμ (transcription du nom sémitique) et Ἱεροσόλυμα (nom hellénistique). D'après Héracléon et les autres gnostiques valentiniens, Ἱερουσαλήμ est la cité céleste (l'Ogdoade), tandis que Ἱεροσόλυμα désigne la Jérusalem terrestre (1). A juste titre, Y. Janssens faisait observer que la même distinction se trouvait déjà chez saint Paul et chez saint Jean (2). Mais c'est dans les écrits lucaniens que le problème se pose de la manière la plus aiguë. Luc est le seul évangéliste qui utilise les deux tournures (3). Nous avons déjà étudié ces textes du III^e évangile dans un article précédent (4). Et nous pensions pouvoir conclure que la distinction des deux noms n'y est pas exactement la même que chez Paul: l'évangéliste n'emploie pas le «nomen sacrum» (Ἱερουσαλήμ) pour décrire la Jérusalem d'en haut (cf. Ga 4,26), mais la Ville Sainte de Judée, considérée comme le lieu

(1) ORIGÈNE, *In Joan.*, X, 33(19): GCS, IV, 206,25-207,29; PG, 14, 365 C; IRÉNÉE, *Adv. Haer.*, I, 5,3; HARVEY, I, 1,9 (=I, p. 46). Cf. A. ORBE, *La Unción del Verbo* (Estudios Valentinianos, III; Roma 1961) 563, n. 1.

(2) Y. JANSSENS, «Héracléon. Commentaire sur l'Évangile selon saint Jean», *Mus* 72 (1959) 101-151, 277-299 (cf. p. 130, n. 25). En effet, Paul, qui utilise uniquement la forme sémitique en Ro et en 1 Co, se sert des deux tournures dans l'épître aux Galates: Ἱεροσόλυμα, quand le sens est simplement géographique (1,17.18; 2,1); Ἱερουσαλήμ est pris au sens théologique (4,25.26). Situation analogue dans les écrits johanniques, comme l'observait déjà Bengel (à propos de Ap 21,2): «in evangelio Ἱεροσόλυμα, in apocalypsi Ἱερουσαλήμ» (= la Cité Sainte, la Jérusalem nouvelle).

(3) Dans Lc, on a 27 fois Ἱερουσαλήμ, quatre fois Ἱεροσόλυμα. Mt et Mc emploient toujours la forme hellénistique, sauf Mt 23,37 («*Ierousalēm, Ierousalēm, toi qui tues les prophètes...*»).

(4) «Les deux noms de Jérusalem dans l'évangile de Luc», *RSR* 69 (1981) 57-80 (= *La parole de grâce. Études lucaniennes à la mémoire d'Augustin George*, 57-80).

d'accomplissement du salut messianique; d'autre part, Ἱεροσόλυμα, pour lui, c'est la ville profane, mais c'est aussi la ville qui s'est rendue coupable de rejeter le Messie, son Seigneur. Dans les pages suivantes, nous voudrions examiner l'usage lucanien des deux noms de Jérusalem dans le livre des Actes.

2. Mais ici, le problème se complique, à cause du nombre élevé de variantes dans la tradition manuscrite. Au terme de l'analyse de tous les textes, nous estimons très probable que l'auteur des Actes parle 59 fois de Jérusalem; mais il l'appelle 36 fois Ἱερουσαλήμ et 23 fois Ἱεροσόλυμα⁽⁵⁾. D'après le relevé de J. K. Elliott, sur ces nombreux emplois du nom sémitique, 28 (dans notre calcul: plus des *trois quarts*) sont sans variantes⁽⁶⁾; par contre, pour les 23 cas où l'on trouve la forme hellénistique Ἱεροσόλυμα, la proportion des textes indiscutés est beaucoup plus faible: 9 seulement (un peu plus d'un tiers) n'ont aucune leçon concurrente⁽⁷⁾. Manifestement, la ten-

(⁵) Ce sont les chiffres que fournit également R. MORGENTHALER, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich-Frankfurt am Main 1958) 106. Chez J. K. Elliott par contre (cf. la note suivante), le compte est assez différent. La tendance de l'auteur (nous verrons dans un instant que c'était aussi celle de plusieurs copistes dans l'histoire de la transmission du texte) est de donner souvent priorité à Ἱερουσαλήμ sur Ἱεροσόλυμα. On s'en rendra compte en comparant ses chiffres à ceux de Morgenthaler (qui sont aussi les nôtres):

	Ἱερουσαλήμ	Ἱεροσόλυμα
Morgenthaler	36	23
Elliott	45	14

Voici les dix textes où Elliott lit la forme *sémitique* (et nous-même, la forme hellénistique): 8,14.25; 15,4; 16,4; 19,21; 20,16; 21,4.15.17; 28,17. C'est uniquement en 25,3 que c'est l'inverse (il préfère ici la forme *hellénistique*).

(⁶) J. K. ELLIOTT, «Jerusalem in Acts and the Gospels», *NTS* 23 (1977) 462-469 (cf. p. 462). Indiquons ces 28 textes: 1,8.12b.19; 2,5.14; 4,5.16; 5,16.28; 8,26; 9,2.13.21.26.28; 12,25; 13,27.31; 15,2a; 21,11.12.13.31; 22,5.17.18; 23,11; 24,11. On peut y joindre 6,7, d'après Elliott lui-même (*art. cit.*, 467: om. 181, seulement), ce qui nous donne un total de 29 textes totalement certains. Ajoutons encore à cette liste 7 autres passages qui sont probablement à retenir, mais où l'on trouve quelque variante: 2,43; 8,27; 10,39; 11,2.22; 20,22; 25,3. La somme des deux séries est donc, comme nous le disions: 29 + 7 = 36 passages avec Ἱερουσαλήμ (Elliott en compte 45). En 2,42, εν ἰλημ (D) doit être écarté. Il reste quelques autres variantes tout à fait mineures, que relève encore Elliott, mais nous n'en tiendrons pas compte.

(⁷) Voici ces 9 textes absolument sûrs: 1,4; 8,1a; 11,27; 13,13; 25,1.7.9; 26,4.10. Mais donnons également la liste des 17 autres passages où Ἱεροσό-

dance de la tradition a été de remplacer assez souvent le nom profane par le nom biblique. Dès lors, on devra faire intervenir ici une règle de critique interne: en cas d'appui extérieur suffisant pour les deux leçons, il faudra donner plutôt la préférence à la *lectio difficilior* Ἱεροσόλυμα. Mais empressons-nous d'ajouter qu'il n'en va pas souvent ainsi: la situation n'est donc pas si mauvaise qu'il le semble; la plupart de ces variantes, faiblement attestées, n'offrent guère de garantie d'authenticité. Il n'y a pratiquement que six textes (sur 59) pour lesquels on pourrait avoir quelque doute, et où l'on trouve en fait une divergence d'opinion chez plusieurs critiques: 2,43; 11,2; 15,4; 19,21; 20,16; 21,4⁽⁸⁾.

Nous les discuterons le moment venu et indiquerons aussi les principales leçons concurrentes pour les autres passages.

3. Mais avant d'aborder l'analyse des textes, il est utile de présenter un bref état de la question: quelles solutions les critiques ont-ils données jusqu'à présent pour expliquer le fait étrange de cet emploi, dans les Actes, de deux noms différents de Jérusalem? Pour évaluer comme il convient les différentes interprétations, il faut tenir compte d'un donné significatif, mais insuffisamment noté: la *répartition différente* des deux formes d'après les sections. En effet, à part la toute première mention du nom de la ville, en 1,4 (Ἱεροσόλυμα), nous trouvons toujours Ἱερουσαλήμ jusqu'à la fin du chapitre 7; de 8 à 19, par contre, les deux formes alternent; puis vient de nouveau une section où prédomine nettement Ἱερουσαλήμ (20-24, surtout à

λυμα paraît dans une partie de la tradition manuscrite: 8,14.25; 15,4; 16,4; 18,21; 19,1.21; 20,16.23; 21,4.15.17; 25,15.20.24; 26,20; 28,17. Trois de ces textes (18,21; 19,1; 20,23), très faiblement attestés, sont à rejeter; nous retenons donc les 14 autres passages de la liste, outre les 9 indiqués au début de cette note. Cela donne, nous l'avons déjà noté, un total de 23 emplois de Ἱεροσόλυμα. (Elliott n'en compte que 14). Nous aurons à expliquer le sens du choix de cette forme hellénistique au fur et à mesure que nous la rencontrons dans notre exposé.

(⁸) Les deux formes (sémitique et hellénistique) sont attestées dans chacun de ces cas (sauf dans le premier: 2,43). Suivant la règle énoncée il y a un instant, on verra que, pour *quatre* des cinq textes qui restent (en 15,4; 19,21; 20,16; 21,4), nous optons pour la forme Ἱεροσόλυμα, avec la plupart des critiques (cf. n. 5); ce n'est qu'en 11,2 que nous maintenons Ἱερουσαλήμ avec les meilleurs manuscrits, et nous verrons plus loin pour quel motif la forme hellénistique du nom a pu y faire intrusion dans quelques témoins (cf. note 31).

partir de 21,11): elle correspond au séjour de l'Apôtre dans la Ville Sainte; mais de 25,7 jusqu'à la fin, Luc n'emploie plus que la forme hellénistique Ἱεροσόλυμα.

Cette répartition par sections est trop régulière pour qu'on puisse se résigner à dire avec B. Lohse qu'il n'est pas possible de découvrir le motif du changement⁽⁹⁾; encore moins admettra-t-on avec H. J. Cadbury qu'il faut l'attribuer tout simplement à la fantaisie changeante de l'auteur⁽¹⁰⁾. Certains commentateurs ont pensé que Luc emploie la forme sémitique ou la forme hellénistique d'après le personnage (juif ou grec) qu'il met en scène ou suivant l'auditoire auquel celui-ci s'adresse⁽¹¹⁾. Mais cette explication, certainement ingénieuse, ne peut rendre compte de tous les cas: ainsi par ex. en 28,17, Paul parle à des Juifs, et il utilise cependant le nom hellénistique Ἱεροσόλυμα (le texte de 1,4 forme, lui aussi, une exception à cette règle). A juste titre, la plupart des auteurs, surtout ces dernières années, s'orientent nettement vers une solution d'ordre théologique. Déjà au début du siècle, W. M. Ramsay, suivi tout récemment par J. Rius-Camps, disait, d'une manière tout à fait générale, que Ἱεροσόλυμα était pour Luc un terme purement géographique, mais que Ἱερουσαλήμ gardait pour lui sa résonance biblique et sacrale⁽¹²⁾.

(9) LOHSE, Σιών, TWNT, VII, 326s.

(10) H. J. CADBURY, «Four Features of Lukan Style», dans: L. E. KECK and J. L. MARTIN, *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia 1980) 87-102: «the changing fancy of the writer»; même opinion chez Wendt.

(11) Cf. J. V. BARTLET, «The Twofold Usage of 'Jerusalem' in the Lucan Writings», *ExpTim* 13 (1901) 157-158; R. SCHÜTZ, «Jerusalem und Hierosolyma im Neuen Testament», *ZNW* 11 (1910) 169-187; J. WANKE, *Die Emmauserzählung. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 24,13-35* (ErfThSt 31; Leipzig 1973) 26-27, n. 6.

On peut joindre à ces travaux celui de J. C. DE YOUNG, *Jerusalem in the New Testament. The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology* (Kampen 1960) 16-22; il propose, lui aussi, une solution d'ordre historique: «... the author was interested in preserving a maximum degree of historical accuracy and authenticity» (p. 16); «Hierosolyma is used to designate Jerusalem as a city in the Roman world. When his story is distinctively Jewish, or ecclesiastical, or when he incorporates the words of Palestinians in their home environment, Jerusalem better suits his purposes» (p. 22).

(12) W. M. RAMSAY, «Professor Harnack on Luke. II», *Expos VII Ser.*, vol. 3 (1907) 97-124 (cf. 110-113): «Many of the places where the form Jerusalem is used are markedly Hieratic and Hebraizing» (p. 112); J. RIUS-CAMPS, «Questions sobre la doble obra lucana. I. La darreda pujada de Pau a Jeru-

Harnack — son étude est une des meilleures sur le sujet, et elle fait encore toujours sentir son influence — s'engageait dans la même direction, mais il combinait cette explication avec la théorie de la distinction des sources: c'est de manière consciente, dit-il, que Luc a distingué l'emploi du nom biblique (religieux) et celui du nom hellénistique (profane); mais cette distinction, ajoute-t-il, ne vaut que dans les «Sections-Nous» et dans les chapitres 1-7 et 22-28; dans 8-21, on ne trouve pas de règle fixe⁽¹³⁾. J. Jeremias et G. Schneider se bornent à dire que Luc, dans les premiers chapitres, utilise presque exclusivement la forme religieuse et théologique (Ἱερουσαλήμ), parce que, pour lui, la formation de la communauté primitive appartient encore au temps de la révélation⁽¹⁴⁾. Mais ni l'un ni l'autre ne présente d'explication pour les variations des noms dans les autres chapitres des Actes. J. Kudasiewicz est l'auteur qui nous a laissé l'étude la plus fouillée sur le sujet. Voici sa position: le nom Ἱεροσόλυμα est toujours employé en un sens géographique et politique; le plus souvent il se lit dans les contextes où sont encore mentionnées d'autres villes de l'Empire; Ἱερουσαλήμ par contre a un sens théologique; elle est la Ville qui a joué un rôle dans l'histoire de l'Église: elle a été en effet le théâtre des persécutions et des souffrances des disciples de Jésus, elle a été l'endroit où ils ont été les témoins de Jésus et où leur témoignage a été rejeté, mais elle a aussi été la Ville où s'est construite l'Église⁽¹⁵⁾. J. Dillon ajoute une précision intéressante: le nom hellénistique commence à l'emporter quand Luc décrit la prédication missionnaire dans le monde grec⁽¹⁶⁾. Mais

salem: 'Desviació' del camí cap a Roma», *RevCatalTeol* 5 (1980) 1-94 (cf. p. 4, n. 6) (l'auteur annonce un article spécial sur la question, en raison de «la magnitud del problema»).

(13) A. VON HARNACK, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament, III; Leipzig 1908) 72-76. Cette nécessité, pour Harnack, de limiter la distinction à certaines sections du livre montre bien que son analyse n'a pas été poussée assez loin et que le problème n'est pas entièrement résolu.

(14) J. JEREMIAS, «Ἱερουσαλήμ / Ἱεροσόλυμα», *ZNW* 65 (1974) 273-276; G. SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, I (Freiburg 1980) 200, n. 19.

(15) J. KUDASIEWICZ, «Nazwy Jeruzalem i Jerozolima w użyciu św. Łukasza», *Roczniki* 20 (1973) 17-36. Nous remercions J. Seremak de nous avoir aidé dans la lecture et l'analyse de cet article polonais.

(16) R. J. DILLON, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* (An-Bib 82; Rome 1978) 88, n. 53.

cet auteur, lui non plus, n'essaie de rendre compte du fait indéniable des alternances dans l'emploi des deux noms à partir du chapitre 8⁽¹⁷⁾. Personne, semble-t-il, n'a encore entrepris une analyse détaillée de tous les passages en les replaçant dans leur contexte. Il faut donc bien se rendre à l'évidence: le dernier mot sur la question n'a toujours pas été dit⁽¹⁸⁾.

Dans les pages qui suivent, nous voudrions soumettre *tous* les textes à un examen détaillé, pour faire progresser la discussion. Le plus simple, sans doute, sera de suivre l'ordre du livre, en y distinguant les grandes sections dont nous avons parlé. A chaque étape nous tâcherons d'expliquer, à partir du contexte, la raison de la préférence de Luc pour la forme sémitique ou pour la forme hellénistique.

Voici d'abord un tableau général de la répartition des deux noms suivant les quatre sections:

	Chapitres	Ἱερουσαλήμ	Ἱεροσόλυμα
I.	1-7	11x	1x
II.	8-19	14x	8x
III.	20-24	10x	4x
IV.	25-28	1x	10x

I. L'Église à Jérusalem (1-7)

1. Cette première série, nous l'avons dit, est caractérisée par l'emploi pratiquement exclusif de la forme sémitique Ἱερουσαλήμ. La seule exception se trouve au début du livre: «Il (Jésus) leur enjoignit de ne pas quitter Jérusalem (ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι), mais d'y attendre ce que le Père avait promis» (1,4). A première vue, semble-t-il, le nom Ἱερουσαλήμ serait bien à sa place ici, puisque le contexte est religieux: il s'agit en effet de l'Ascension du Christ et de la promesse de l'Esprit. Mais plusieurs auteurs font

(17) Cf. la juste remarque de WANKE, *Die Emmauserzählung*, 27, n. 6: «Doch ist damit nicht das Nebeneinander der Wortformen, besonders in der Apg, erklärt».

(18) Cf. H. J. HAUSER, *Strukturen der Abschlusserzählung der Apostelgeschichte (Apg 28,16-31)* (AnBib 86; Rome 1979) 96, n. 104; après un bref exposé de différentes théories, il conclut: «Das letzte Wort zum Problem ist sicherlich noch nicht gesprochen!».

observer à juste titre que ce cas est tout à fait spécial⁽¹⁹⁾, étant donné que c'est la première mention du nom de la ville dans les Actes: au début de son ouvrage, s'adressant à des lecteurs du monde hellénistique (cf. probablement une indication en ce sens dans l'adresse à ce personnage d'un certain rang qu'était «Théophile», 1,1), Luc désigne la ville par le nom qui était en usage dans leur milieu⁽²⁰⁾. Ajoutons que, à ces tout premiers mots de l'entretien de Jésus avec ses apôtres (1,4-8), le lecteur n'est pas encore censé savoir que «Jérusalem», au début de l'Église, restera pour un temps la «Ville Sainte» des chrétiens. Cela n'apparaît qu'immédiatement après, avec la mention de la venue prochaine de l'*Esprit* (vv. 4b. 5b. 8a) et l'indication de Jérusalem comme point de départ de la *mission apostolique* (v. 8b). En 1,4a, le sens de «Jérusalem» est encore neutre.

2. Mais à partir de 1,8, et jusqu'à la fin de la section, il n'est plus question que de Ἱερουσαλήμ⁽²¹⁾. Cela se comprend parfaitement: cette première période de l'histoire chrétienne est sacrée, quasi hiératique, car c'est la période du baptême de l'Église dans l'Esprit Saint⁽²²⁾, c'est la première étape chrétienne de l'histoire du salut. Elle engageait l'avenir. Il est donc important de bien analyser ces onze passages, pour voir ce que furent d'après Luc les traits essentiels de la communauté primitive, à cette époque où elle s'est formée.

Parmi les emplois du nom Ἱερουσαλήμ dans ces sept premiers chapitres, on peut distinguer deux groupes. Le premier se rapporte

⁽¹⁹⁾ Le cas est analogue dans le premier emploi du nom de la ville dans le III^e évangile (cf. Lc 2,22).

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. Harnack, de Young, et surtout SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, I, 200.

⁽²¹⁾ Voici les textes: 1,8.12.19; 2,5.14.43; 4,5.16; 5,16.28; 6,7. On observera qu'au chapitre 7 (dans le discours d'Étienne) manque toute mention du nom de la ville (cf. simplement en 7,58: ἔξω τῆς πόλεως).

⁽²²⁾ HARNACK, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 74: «Im übrigen [après 1,4] ist ihm in der *Urgeschichte der Gemeinde* [nous soulignons] alles so erhaben, dass er nur von Ἱερουσαλήμ (11 mal) spricht.» Cette explication est nettement préférable à celle de J. C. de Young, qui voit uniquement l'aspect ethnique et historique de la première communauté chrétienne: «the *distinctively Jewish* atmosphere of the Jerusalem Christian community» (*Jerusalem*, 17; les italiques sont de nous). Pour Luc, certes, Ἱερουσαλήμ est ici très importante, mais non pas en tant que ville juive; c'est essentiellement parce qu'elle est le lieu de naissance de la communauté chrétienne.

aux Juifs. On est frappé de voir apparaître ici jusqu'à quatre fois l'expression «ceux qui habitent (οἱ κατοικοῦντες) Jérusalem» (1,19; 2,5.14; 4,16). C'est une formule biblique, plus ou moins stéréotypée dans les écrits du temps de l'exil et d'après⁽²³⁾. Mais pourquoi Luc la reprend-il avec une telle insistance? On peut y voir un indice de sa volonté de souligner que les événements fondateurs de l'histoire chrétienne devaient s'accomplir dans la Ville Sainte d'Israël et qu'ils avaient une valeur de témoignage pour les «hommes de Judée» (2,14), surtout pour «les habitants de Jérusalem». D'après le premier discours de Pierre, en effet, la glorification du Christ constituait une interpellation pour «toute la maison d'Israël» (2,36). La formule de Luc est donc une sorte d'anticipation du «*Judaeo primum*» paulinien (Ro 1,16; 2,9.10). Et cependant, presque immédiatement se manifesta l'opposition des autorités juives. Le récit du procès de Pierre et de Jean devant le Sanhédrin est comme une reprise du procès de Jésus; il s'ouvre sur ces mots: «Le lendemain s'assemblèrent les chefs, les anciens et les scribes qui se trouvaient à Jérusalem» (4,5). Cette ville, qui «n'avait pas reconnu le temps où elle avait été visitée» par Jésus, le Roi-Messie (cf. Lc 19,44), mit aussi en accusation les premiers témoins de la résurrection de Jésus.

Mais l'autre groupe de textes se rapporte directement aux apôtres eux-mêmes. Dans le premier sommaire, Luc insiste sur le fait que «beaucoup de prodiges et de signes s'accomplissaient par les apôtres à Jérusalem» (2,43)⁽²⁴⁾; et plus loin: «La multitude accourait aussi des localités voisines de Jérusalem, portant des malades et des

(23) Οἱ κατοικοῦντες (ἐν) Ἱερουσαλήμ: 2 Chr 19,8; 20,15.18.20; 21,11.13; 22,1; 31,4; 32,22.26.33; 34,30.32; Jr 4,3; 8,1; 11,2.9.12; 17,25; 18,11; 19,3; 49[42],18; Za 12,5-7.10; 13,1 (v.l.); 14,11; Ba 1,15; cf. aussi Ps 134(135),21: «Béni soit Yahvé depuis Sion, lui qui *habite Jérusalem!*» Ce dernier texte fait mieux comprendre la résonance de l'expression «les habitants de Jérusalem». Elle est rarement neutre: elle est employée le plus souvent dans un contexte de châtement, de conversion ou de salut. La même chose peut se dire pour son emploi dans les Actes.

(24) Les mots ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, acceptés par Tischendorf, Hetzenauer, Vogels, Elliott, Bover-O'Callaghan (Soden est hésitant), se trouvent dans P⁷⁴ vid. SCAΨE min. lat.; ils semblent requis par le contexte (cf. l'autre mention du lieu des miracles: 5,16!). La raison de leur omission par plusieurs témoins, dans ce sommaire à tendance *généralisante*, peut avoir été qu'on ne voulait pas donner l'impression que l'activité thaumaturgique des apôtres ne s'était exercée qu'à Jérusalem.

gens que tourmentaient des esprits impurs, et tous étaient guéris» (5,16). On le voit: «au nom de Jésus Christ, le Nazaréen» (3,6), l'œuvre du salut réalisée par Jésus commençait à porter ses fruits, là même où Jésus était mort et ressuscité, à *Jérusalem*. Mais la Ville Sainte était surtout le lieu où se constituait peu à peu la communauté chrétienne. Les autorités juives reprochaient aux apôtres de «remplir Jérusalem de (leur) doctrine» (5,28). Et Luc insiste sur l'effet produit par leur prédication: «La parole de Dieu croissait et le nombre des disciples augmentait considérablement à Jérusalem; et une multitude de prêtres obéissait à la foi» (6,7). C'était la réalisation de ce qu'avait annoncé Jésus à l'Ascension: les apôtres, regagnant Jérusalem (1,12), devaient y recevoir le don de l'Esprit; grâce à cette force divine, ils allaient devenir les témoins de Jésus, «à Jérusalem, dans toute la Judée et la Samarie, et jusqu'aux extrémités de la terre» (1,8). C'est à décrire la mise en œuvre de cet immense programme que Luc s'emploie dans tout le livre des Actes; il s'agissait de raconter comment s'était effectuée l'expansion universelle du christianisme, de Jérusalem aux extrémités de la terre⁽²⁵⁾.

II. Les Apôtres à Jérusalem et la mission apostolique (8-19)

Au chapitre 8, le climat change. Après la période quelque peu idyllique du début, où les chrétiens de Jérusalem vivaient encore entre eux, dans la paix, la prière et la communion fraternelle, vient «une notice sur la persécution et la dispersion de l'Église (vv. 1b-4), qui introduit le récit des missions évangéliques de Philippe (8,5-40) et de Pierre (9,32-11,18)»⁽²⁶⁾. C'est pour cette série de douze chapitres que l'analyse de l'emploi des deux noms de Jérusalem est la plus délicate. L'alternance très régulière des deux formes y est frappante, et ne peut être le fait du hasard. Il nous semble qu'on peut l'expliquer par l'emploi constant d'une règle fondamentale: quand la perspective dominante est celle de la *mission apostolique* et de la *dispersion* au loin, en terre samaritaine ou païenne, Luc ne désigne plus Jérusalem que du nom profane Ἱεροσόλυμα; et quand il se sert

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. J. DUPONT, «Le salut des gentils et la signification théologique du livre des Actes», *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (Lectio divina 45; Paris 1967) 393-419.

⁽²⁶⁾ *Bible de Jérusalem*, note m, à Ac 8,1.

encore du nom religieux Ἱερουσαλήμ, c'est pour en parler comme du lieu central de la prière d'Israël, mais c'est surtout pour rappeler ce qu'y avait accompli *Jésus* ou pour décrire les fonctions des *apôtres* dans la Ville Sainte. En adoptant ce principe d'explication, on peut rendre compte de l'alternance des deux noms dans les douze chapitres de Ac 8-19; nous pouvons sans peine y reconnaître cinq étapes:

- | Nom hellénistique | Nom sémitique |
|---|------------------------|
| 1) 8,1-25: 3 fois | 2) 8,26-11,26: 10 fois |
| 3) 11,27-13,13: 2 fois
(+ 1 fois le nom sémitique) | 4) 13,14-15,3: 3 fois |
| 5) 15,4-19,21: 3 fois | |

On le voit, il y a deux sections (1 et 5) avec l'emploi exclusif du nom *hellénistique*, et deux (2 et 4) qui ont uniquement le nom *sémitique*; dans la section centrale (3), les deux noms alternent, mais avec une insistance plus grande sur Ἱεροσόλυμα (11,27 hell.; 12,25 sémit.; 13,13 hell.). Cependant, pour l'ensemble de ces douze chapitres, quoiqu'il y ait trois sections «hellénistiques» contre deux «sémitiques», il y a malgré tout une nette prédominance de Ἱερουσαλήμ ($10 + 1 + 3 = 14$ fois) sur Ἱεροσόλυμα ($3 + 2 + 3 = 8$ fois): même au cours des missions de Paul et de ses compagnons, le souvenir du Christ et la présence des apôtres inspirent encore aux croyants un respect religieux pour «Jérusalem».

1. Ἱεροσόλυμα (trois fois)

Dans la première péricope de cette longue section (8,1-25), après la brève introduction des vv. 1b-4, Luc raconte ce que fut le début de la *mission chrétienne*, celle de Samarie. Le martyre d'Étienne avait provoqué la dispersion des croyants; mais celle-ci eut au moins un résultat heureux: l'Évangile allait maintenant passer de lieu en lieu (8,4). Dans tout cet ensemble ouvert sur la mission, Jérusalem n'est plus, dès lors, que Ἱεροσόλυμα (vv. 1.14.25). Le récit commence sur ces mots: «En ce jour-là, une violente persécution éclata contre l'église de Jérusalem» (8,1b). La *TOB* commente très bien: «Pour la première fois, le mot *église* est suivi ici d'une détermination géographique: on pressent que d'autres églises locales vont être fondées (cf.

11,22; 13,1)»⁽²⁷⁾. L'église de Jérusalem, comme église locale, n'ayant rien de spécifique par rapport aux autres églises, est appelée tout simplement par Luc τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις⁽²⁸⁾. Au v. 14, il est vrai, Luc parle des «apôtres (qui étaient) à Jérusalem (ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις)»; mais le nom grec de la ville se comprend, ici encore, car l'optique du verset reste exclusivement missionnaire: «Apprenant que la Samarie avait *accueilli la parole de Dieu*, les apôtres (...) y *envoyèrent* Pierre et Jean». Ces deux apôtres, envoyés en mission à Samarie, sont les héros de tout l'épisode. C'est ce qui ressort du verset de conclusion: «Pour eux (Pierre et Jean), après avoir rendu témoignage et *annoncé la parole* du Seigneur, ils retournèrent à Jérusalem (εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) en *portant la Bonne Nouvelle* à de nombreux villages *samaritains*» (v. 25)⁽²⁹⁾.

⁽²⁷⁾ TOB, note d, à Ac 8,1. Ce recours à l'idée de l'*expansion* de l'Église hors de Jérusalem est plus convaincant que l'explication de J. Kudasiewicz (cf. n. 15), qui estime que Luc, en 8,1.14.25, utilise Ἱεροσόλυμα, parce que ce nom se trouve dans le voisinage de celui d'autres villes de l'Empire. Mais peut-on considérer la capitale des Samaritains comme une ville de l'Empire?

⁽²⁸⁾ Rappelons que c'est le premier emploi de Ἱεροσόλυμα depuis l'introduction (1,4). Contre ce que nous disons dans notre texte, sur le sens non spécifique de «l'église de Jérusalem» en 8,1, on pourrait objecter qu'en 11,22 la formule est presque la même et que Luc y emploie cependant la forme sémitique. Mais la comparaison entre les deux textes est riche d'enseignement: elle montre jusqu'où Luc a su pousser le sens des nuances. En 8,1, «l'église de Jérusalem» (τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις) est simplement l'assemblée des *fidèles* de cette ville; de ce point de vue, elle est semblable aux autres communautés: «Tous (= tous les chrétiens) se dispersèrent dans les contrées de la Judée et de la Samarie, à l'exception des apôtres»; il s'agit clairement de la dislocation et de la *dispersion* de toute la communauté primitive; il n'est fait allusion aux apôtres qu'*après* la mention de «l'église de Jérusalem». En 11,22, au contraire, Luc parle de «l'église qui était à Jérusalem» (τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς οὐσῆς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ): déjà du seul point de vue stylistique, cette formule avec le participe est légèrement plus emphatique que celle de 8,1; Luc considère ici cette église du point de vue de la *responsabilité* qu'elle exerce; cela confère à «Jérusalem», l'église-mère, un halo d'*autorité* sur l'église d'Antioche: «Cette église [de Jérusalem] use d'un droit de regard sur les autres Églises» (BJ, note g, sur Ac 11,22). Voir aussi note 32.

⁽²⁹⁾ Pour le problème de critique textuelle dans ces deux versets (8,14.25), voir la note suivante.

2. Ἱερουσαλήμ (dix fois)

Dans la deuxième étape par contre (8,26–11,26), on trouve de nouveau, et beaucoup plus souvent, l'emploi exclusif du nom sémitique (8,26.27; 9,2.13.21.26.28; 10,39; 11,2.22). La perspective de cette section, en effet, est différente de celle de la péricope précédente (8,1-25). Dans aucun des passages cités, il n'est directement question de la mission. En 8,26.27, Jérusalem est décrite comme le centre religieux d'Israël⁽³⁰⁾. Dans l'épisode du baptême de l'*eunuque éthiopien*, Philippe reçut de l'Ange du Seigneur l'ordre de se rendre «sur la route qui descend de Jérusalem à Gaza» (8,26); poussé par l'Esprit (v. 29), il rejoignit l'eunuque: celui-ci retournait chez lui, après avoir été «adorer Dieu (προσκυνήσων) à Jérusalem» (8,27), ce qui impliquait un dépassement des prescriptions de la loi mosaïque sur les eunuques (Dt 23,2). Jérusalem est ici la Ville Sainte, le lieu où l'on monte «pour adorer» (24,11; Jn 4,20): c'est d'elle que revient l'eunuque après son pèlerinage; c'est sur cette même route de Jérusalem que descend Philippe, et après son entretien avec l'eunuque, il le baptise. Au chapitre 9 également reparait à diverses reprises le nom religieux de la Ville Sainte (vv. 2.13.21.26.28). Cette fois l'optique est formellement chrétienne: c'est le célèbre récit de la vocation

(30) Pour ELLIOTT, «*Jerusalem*», 463, la raison de l'emploi de Ἱερουσαλήμ en 7,8–9,31 serait que «the church is still on Jewish soil». Mais faut-il entendre cela au sens ethnique ou religieux? Au sujet de 8,27, en tout cas, sa remarque est parfaitement exacte: «At 8,27 Jerusalem is seen as the city of Jewish worship...» (p. 465). Mais Elliott semble faire valoir le même argument (celui du contexte juif) pour expliquer 8,14.25, où il lit également la forme sémitique du nom. Or, d'après les indications de l'auteur lui-même, pour 8,14, cette leçon ne se lit que dans D; pour 8,25, son attestation est un peu meilleure: on la trouve dans la koinè (LPH 623, 460 *et al.*), contre Ἱεροσόλυμα en BSCADE. On comprend qu'avec tous les autres critiques nous ayons maintenu la leçon hellénistique à ces deux endroits. Mais cela nous oblige aussi d'*expliquer* cet emploi du nom Ἱεροσόλυμα (cf. *supra* dans le texte). Un argument supplémentaire pour lire εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα en 8,25 nous est fourni par l'inclusion de ce verset avec εἰς Καισάρειαν en 8,40 (deux noms hellénistiques), du moins si on accepte la structure littéraire proposée par D. MÍNGUEZ, «*Hechos 8,25-40. Análisis estructural del relato*», *Bib* 57 (1976) 168-181 (pp. 171 et 176). Mais on pourrait aussi penser que 8,25 forme inclusion avec l'introduction 8,1-4: ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις... Σαμαρείας... εὐαγγελιζόμενοι... // εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα... Σαμαριτῶν εὐαγγελίζοντο. Dans ce cas également, le parallélisme entre 8,1 et 8,25 invite à lire les deux fois le nom hellénistique (en 8,1, cette forme est acceptée par Elliott).

de Saul. Aux vv. 2.13.21, Jérusalem est d'abord présentée comme le théâtre de l'action du persécuteur contre les chrétiens. Après sa conversion et sa prédication à Damas, Saul arrive de nouveau à Jérusalem (v. 26), mais maintenant en tant que témoin du Christ: «Dès lors Saul allait et venait avec eux dans Jérusalem, parlant avec assurance au nom du Seigneur» (v. 28). Malheureusement cette prédication déclencha une opposition violente de la part des Hellénistes (v. 29). Malgré cela, pour Luc, cette mention répétée de Ἱερουσαλήμ à propos de *Paul* gardait son importance: l'ancien persécuteur, qui allait devenir l'Apôtre des nations, avait d'abord rendu témoignage de Jésus dans la Ville Sainte, à Jérusalem (23,11), là où se trouvaient les autres apôtres (cf. Ga 2,2).

Les deux mentions suivantes du nom Ἱερουσαλήμ appartiennent au cycle de la mission de *Pierre* à Césarée. Le contexte, certes, est celui de la prédication aux païens. L'emploi du nom sacré de Jérusalem ne pose pourtant aucun problème, car Luc s'en sert pour rappeler les lieux et les jours de la fondation du christianisme. Le discours dans la maison de Corneille contient d'abord un résumé du kérygme primitif, «la bonne nouvelle de la paix en Jésus Christ» (10,36). Après avoir expliqué en peu de mots ce qu'avait été l'activité bienfaisante de Jésus, Pierre continue: «Et nous sommes témoins de tout *ce qu'il a fait* dans tout le pays des Juifs et à Jérusalem» (10,39). Ἱερουσαλήμ, dans cette optique, est le théâtre principal de ce qu'avait été l'action prophétique et thaumaturgique de Jésus. Mais Pierre lui-même se voit bientôt dans l'obligation de «(remonter) à Jérusalem» (11,2), pour se justifier d'avoir mangé dans la maison d'un circoncis⁽³¹⁾. Grâce à son intervention, l'assemblée retrouva son

⁽³¹⁾ En 11,2, il faut lire (ἀνέβη...) εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ avec P⁴⁵ BSA 81, 1898, 181 et presque tous les éditeurs; la leçon εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα de D sy vg n'est adoptée que par Soden, Hilgenfeld et Clark. Mais le nom sémitique s'impose: il s'agit d'une démarche de *Pierre*, et cela, auprès de l'église de Jérusalem, qui est donc censée posséder une certaine *autorité*. Cas semblable en 15,2, comme nous le verrons: Paul et Barnabé doivent «monter auprès des *apôtres* et des *anciens*, à Jérusalem (εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ), à propos de ce différend» (le problème de la circoncision); l'expression (συν)αναβαίνειν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ (une formule technique du langage culturel *juif*) sera employée pour le groupe des disciples de Jésus en 13,31, et deux fois encore pour Paul (outre 15,2): en 21,12 et 24,11; en 25, 9, où c'est le procureur Festus qui parle, Luc emploie le nom hellénistique, εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀναβάς: on notera l'inversion des mots (ce qui permet d'éviter la formule consacrée «monter à Jérusalem»).

calme, et tous glorifiaient Dieu en disant: «Ainsi donc, Dieu a donné aussi aux nations païennes la conversion qui mène à la Vie!» (11,28). Même à Césarée, Ἱερουσαλήμ restait donc encore à double titre un point de référence obligé: tout d'abord parce que c'était le lieu où s'était accomplie l'œuvre salvifique de *Jésus*; puis aussi parce que, en cette première période de l'Église, c'était devant «les *apôtres* et les frères établis en Judée» (11,1) que devaient se prendre les grandes options pour la mission apostolique.

Le dernier emploi du nom théologique dans cette section (11,22) s'explique de la même façon. En 11,19-26, Luc raconte la fondation de l'église d'Antioche: le contexte est donc bien celui de la dispersion hors de Jérusalem (cf. 11,19: «ceux qui avaient été dispersés lors de la tribulation...»). Et cependant, au v. 22, il est de nouveau question de «l'église *qui est* à Jérusalem». Nous avons déjà dit plus haut pourquoi, à cet endroit, le nom de la ville est Ἱερουσαλήμ⁽³²⁾: «Jérusalem» est, ici encore, l'*église responsable*; c'est pourquoi elle envoya à Antioche un délégué, Barnabé: lui et Paul travaillèrent une année entière dans cette église «et y instruisirent une foule considérable» (11,26).

saalem») et le fait que l'idée de *monter* ne se trouve pas dans le verbe principal, mais est placée en tête, dans un participe (ce qui fait tomber l'accent sur l'idée essentielle, d'ordre juridique: «Veux-tu *être jugé*...?»); pour 21,15 et 25,1, voir plus loin.

Comment expliquer qu'en 11,2 ait été introduite la leçon εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα dans D? Pierre monte «à Jérusalem»; mais c'est pour tomber sur les «circoncis». Le fait d'éviter ici Ἱερουσαλήμ (qui indique le plus souvent la sphère d'influence des *apôtres*) peut correspondre à la tendance de D de montrer que Jérusalem a été plutôt le lieu du *conflit* entre les apôtres et les autorités juives (cf. ELLIOTT, 467).

⁽³²⁾ Voir note 28. — Une comparaison entre 8,14 et 11,22 est suggestive: dans les deux cas, il s'agit de l'envoi de quelqu'un en mission. Pourquoi dès lors Luc emploie-t-il le nom hellénistique en 8,14 et le nom sémitique en 11,22a? Une double nuance distingue les deux textes: 1) suivant la règle indiquée plus loin (n. 35), il faut reconnaître qu'en 8,14 le verbe principal décrit uniquement le mouvement *centrifuge* de l'envoi en mission; en 11,22, l'envoi est mentionné dans le deuxième membre (11,22b), mais il est précédé d'un mouvement *centripète* (11,22a); or, c'est là qu'est mentionnée Jérusalem: «le bruit de cet événement *parvint aux oreilles* de l'église qui était à Jérusalem»; 2) comme il a été dit (n. 28), la formule de 11,22 (avec τῆς οἰκῆς) souligne nettement la responsabilité de l'église-mère: celle-ci est pour ainsi dire identifiée à «Jérusalem» (cf. dans la tradition postérieure: «*Rome*» a dit que...).

3. Ἱεροσόλυμα – Ἱερουσαλήμ – Ἱεροσόλυμα

La troisième section (11,27-13,13) contient trois fois le nom de Jérusalem (11,27; 12,25; 13,13); mais ici, comme nous l'avons déjà observé, la forme hellénistique (11,27; 13,13) alterne paradoxalement avec la forme sémitique (12,25). Pourquoi? A première vue, on trouvera étrange qu'après l'emploi de Ἱερουσαλήμ dans la péricope précédente (en 11,22: cf. supra), Luc utilise maintenant Ἱεροσόλυμα: «En ces jours-là, des prophètes descendaient de Jérusalem à Antioche. L'un d'eux, appelé Agabus, . . .» (11,27-28). Mais à la différence de ce que nous constatons en 11,22, Jérusalem, dans ce nouveau contexte, n'a aucun caractère distinctif ou officiel. Comme le note très bien la TOB: «Il y avait donc, dans l'église de *Jérusalem*, des prophètes (cf. 15,32; 21,10), comme plus tard à *Antioche* (13,1); à *Éphèse* (19,6) et à *Césarée* (21,9) également, des chrétiens prophétiseront»⁽³³⁾. L'emploi du nom hellénistique, en 11,27, est tout à fait semblable à celui de 8,1⁽³⁴⁾: même ouverture sur les diverses églises de la dispersion.

Le chapitre 12 nous transporte à Jérusalem, avec Barnabé et Saul, qui ont reçu mission à Antioche de porter des secours aux frères de Judée (cf. 11,29). Dans la Ville Sainte, nous assistons à l'arrestation de Pierre et à sa délivrance miraculeuse. A la fin du chapitre, Luc transcrit encore une fois sa phrase favorite: «La parole de Dieu croissait et se multipliait» (12,24). Puis il conclut: «Quant à Barnabé et Saul, ils s'en revinrent de Jérusalem après avoir assuré leur service (τὴν διακονίαν)» (12,25). Il est compréhensible que Luc ait ici choisi la forme religieuse Ἱερουσαλήμ: il veut décrire le «service» fraternel rendu par Paul et Barnabé à Jérusalem, pour assurer la communion avec l'église-mère⁽³⁵⁾.

⁽³³⁾ TOB, note v, à Ac 11,27. Les italiques pour les noms des villes sont de nous. La note montre bien que Jérusalem est considérée ici du même point de vue que les autres villes où il y a des chrétiens.

⁽³⁴⁾ Voir plus haut, note 28.

⁽³⁵⁾ TOB, note z, à Ac 11,29: «Aux démarches qui vont de *Jérusalem* à *Antioche* (vv. 22,27), répond maintenant ce service (une collecte probablement), ce geste de partage qui va d'*Antioche* à *Jérusalem*. Ainsi s'étend la communion caractéristique de la première communauté (2,44 . . .)» (les deux premières fois, les italiques sont de nous). Dans l'interprétation de la préférence de Luc pour Ἱερουσαλήμ ou pour Ἱεροσόλυμα, l'analyse du mouvement ou de l'orientation des démarches officielles est importante (centripète: d'une

Le troisième texte de la section (13,13) nous replonge en plein dans le contexte de la mission: de 13,1 à 14,28, Luc décrit le premier grand voyage missionnaire de Paul en terre païenne. Après un séjour à Chypre, «Paul et ses compagnons s'embarquèrent à Paphos et gagnèrent Pergé, en Pamphylie» (13,13a). Et Luc poursuit: «C'est alors que Jean (= Jean Marc) se sépara d'eux pour retourner à Jérusalem (εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα)» (v. 13b). Il ne s'agit pas d'une «*montée* à Jérusalem» (formule à résonance liturgique), mais d'un retour à la maison; Jérusalem n'est pas décrite ici comme le centre de la présence des apôtres; elle est la ville que Jean Marc avait quittée avec Paul et Barnabé pour les accompagner en mission (12,25), et où, avec une certaine pusillanimité, il voulait maintenant rentrer. Quand Paul sera sur le point de partir pour un second voyage, il décidera de ne pas reprendre comme compagnon «un homme qui les avait quittés en Pamphylie et n'avait donc pas partagé leur travail» (15,38). En 13,13, le nom profane Ἱεροσόλυμα utilisé par Luc indiquait simplement la ville où habitait le chrétien Jean Marc (12,12).

4. Ἱερουσαλήμ (trois fois)

Les deux premiers passages de la section 13,14–15,3 où l'on rencontre le nom de Jérusalem (13,27.31) appartiennent au contexte du premier voyage missionnaire de Paul: ils font partie de son discours dans la synagogue d'Antioche de Pisidie (13,26–41). Les textes sont tout à fait semblables à celui de 10,39 (le verset du discours de Pierre à Césarée expliqué plus haut): ces discours des deux apôtres sont deux exemples du kérygme en milieu païen. Comme Pierre dans la maison de Corneille, Paul à Antioche de Pisidie rappelle les événements majeurs de la vie de Jésus: «Les habitants de Jérusalem et leurs chefs l'ont méconnu, lui, ainsi que les paroles des prophètes qu'on lit chaque sabbat: en le condamnant, ils les ont accomplies» (13,27)⁽³⁶⁾. «Mais Dieu l'a ressuscité des morts; et il est apparu pendant plusieurs jours à ceux qui étaient montés avec lui de Galilée à Jérusalem, eux qui sont maintenant ses témoins devant le peuple. Et nous, nous vous annonçons la Bonne Nouvelle: la promesse faite à

église de la dispersion *vers Jérusalem*; centrifuge: de Jérusalem *vers la mission*). Voir plus loin p. 171 et note 43.

⁽³⁶⁾ On retrouve ici la formule biblique οἱ κατοικοῦντες (ἐν) Ἱερουσαλήμ, rencontrée plusieurs fois dans les premiers chapitres; voir plus haut p. 160 et note 23.

nos pères» (13,30-32). Le contexte de la mort et de la résurrection de *Jésus* et le rappel du témoignage que les *apôtres* (les Douze) lui avaient rendu «devant le peuple»⁽³⁷⁾ imposaient tout naturellement ici le choix du nom Ἱερουσαλήμ.

A la fin de sa mission en Asie mineure, Paul revient à Antioche. Là éclata le conflit qui l'opposa, lui et Barnabé, à un groupe de judaïsants descendus de Judée, qui voulaient imposer la circoncision aux nouveaux chrétiens venus du paganisme (15,1-2a). Le dénouement de ce conflit ne pouvait s'obtenir qu'à l'*Assemblée de Jérusalem*; c'est pourquoi «on décida que Paul, Barnabé et quelques autres des leurs monteraient auprès des apôtres et des anciens, à Jérusalem, à propos de ce différend» (15,2). L'emploi de Ἱερουσαλήμ, ici, était obvie: ce nom symbolisait pour tous l'autorité indiscutée du groupe apostolique.

5. Ἱεροσόλυμα (trois fois)

Il est donc d'autant plus surprenant que, deux versets plus loin, quand il décrit l'arrivée de Paul et Barnabé dans la Ville Sainte, Luc introduise le nom profane: «Arrivés à Jérusalem (εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα), ils furent accueillis par l'église, les apôtres et les anciens, et ils rapportèrent tout ce que Dieu avait réalisé avec eux» (15,4). Il fallait s'y attendre: bon nombre de manuscrits ont ici le nom sémitique Ἱερουσαλήμ, comme au v. 2. Mais nous avons de solides raisons pour maintenir la forme hellénistique du nom⁽³⁸⁾. Pourquoi Luc l'a-t-il

⁽³⁷⁾ L. CERFAUX a très bien montré que le «témoignage», dans les Actes, est fondamentalement la tâche des Douze, devant les Juifs, à Jérusalem: «Témoins du Christ d'après le Livre des Actes», *Recueil L. Cerfaux*, II (Gembloux 1954) 157-174; voici ce qu'il écrit à propos de notre texte: «La distinction entre le témoignage (à Jérusalem) et le message (au loin) est nettement marquée dans le discours de saint Paul à Antioche de Pisidie (...). Le témoignage, c'est donc pour le peuple, c'est-à-dire concrètement pour les Juifs de Jérusalem; dans la diaspora, même pour les Juifs (...), il y a 'annonce' ou 'message' plutôt que 'témoignage'» (p. 162).

⁽³⁸⁾ Voici la répartition des témoins pour les deux leçons: Ἱεροσόλυμα P⁷⁴ BA 326, 1175, 81, 048 *et al.*, lat.; Ἱερουσαλήμ SCDELPH etc.; la première leçon est acceptée par Westcott-Hort, Weiss, Soden, Vogels, Jacquier, Kilpatrick, Nestle, Merk, de Young, Bover-O'Callaghan; mais Hetzenauer, Scrivener, Souter, Tischendorf, Hilgenfeld, Clark, GNT et Elliott choisissent la seconde. A notre sens, tout indique, que εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα est la *lectio difficilior* (cf. DE YOUNG, 21, n. 96): de nombreux témoins l'ont corrigée en εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, évidemment pour harmoniser le verset avec 15,2 (εἰς Ἱερου-

introduite ici? L'explication a été cherchée dans la bonne direction par J. C. de Young⁽³⁹⁾: dans la phrase du v. 2 («... Paul et Barnabé... monteraient auprès des *apôtres* et des *anciens*, à Jérusalem»), le nom Ἱερουσαλήμ, *venant après*, est comme une reprise synthétique de l'expression «les apôtres et les anciens»; le nom religieux de la ville évoquait symboliquement la présence des apôtres; au v. 4, au contraire, Ἱεροσόλυμα *vient en premier lieu* et est simplement l'indication géographique de la ville où Paul et Barnabé arrivent; *après cela* seulement, le groupe des chrétiens les accueille: «l'église, les apôtres et les anciens»; la ville et la communauté chrétienne, cette fois, sont nettement dissociées⁽⁴⁰⁾.

σαλήμ); cette «correction» était d'autant plus tentante que les deux versets, proches l'un de l'autre, ont un contenu à peu près identique. Aussi ne voit-on pas d'où serait venue ici la forme hellénistique, si elle n'était pas primitive. C'est donc la leçon authentique.

(³⁹) J. C. DE YOUNG, 21-22; il conclut: «Luke's distinction is a fine one, and we are not surprised that many scribes 'copied' Jerusalem instead of the original Hierosolyma. Evidently to Luke there was a sufficient difference in meaning to require the use of both forms within such short compass in his narrative.»

(⁴⁰) La structure concentrique de 15,1-5 (schéma: a, b, c, b', c') permet de mieux saisir la différence entre les deux versets. Bornons-nous à deux remarques:

1) les vv. 2 et 4 (b, b') sont parallèles, mais on observera l'ordre inverse des mots qui nous intéressent:

- b) πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους

εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ

- b') εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα...

ὑπὸ... τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων

Dans le premier cas, le groupe «des apôtres et des anciens» est *repris équivalement* dans Ἱερουσαλήμ qui *suit* (prépositions *analogues*: πρὸς - εἰς); dans le deuxième membre, Ἱεροσόλυμα *précède* et est *dissocié* du groupe des apôtres (prépositions et fonctions *différentes*: εἰς - ὑπὸ).

2) παρεδέχθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας du v.4 est une reprise antithétique de προπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας du v.3; mais là, «l'église (d'Antioche)» formait elle-même une sorte de parallélisme avec «les apôtres et les anciens, à Jérusalem» (v.2), ce qui désignait implicitement Jérusalem comme le lieu de l'église et de la présence des *apôtres*; au v. 4, au contraire, le nom de la ville (Ἱεροσόλυμα), placé en tête, est comme détaché de «l'église, les apôtres et les anciens». Dans ces quelques versets, une dissociation importante est en train de s'opérer: entre «Jérusalem» d'une part et «l'église, les apôtres et les anciens» de l'autre. Jérusalem, vue ainsi, ne sera plus qu'une ville parmi d'autres. Cette disjonction, qui commence ici,

Dans la section 15,4–19,21, on rencontre une deuxième mention de Jérusalem en 16,4: le contexte est celui du deuxième voyage missionnaire de Paul (15,36–18,22), plus concrètement, son passage à Derbé et à Lystres. «Dans les villes où ils passaient, écrit Luc, Paul et Silas transmettaient, en recommandant de s'y conformer, les décisions prises par les apôtres et les anciens de Jérusalem» (16,4). Plusieurs manuscrits, probablement sous l'influence de la formule semblable de 15,2, ont introduit ici aussi Ἱερουσαλήμ⁽⁴¹⁾. Il ne suffit pas de dire avec J. K. Elliott que Luc parle ici des apôtres et des anciens à Jérusalem et qu'il faut donc accepter cette leçon sémitique⁽⁴²⁾. Avec l'ensemble des autres critiques, nous croyons devoir maintenir, ici encore, le nom Ἱεροσόλυμα. Mais comment l'expliquer? La comparaison avec les deux autres passages des Actes où les *apôtres* sont mentionnés en même temps que *Jérusalem* est très éclairante: il s'agit de 8,14 et 15,2. En 15,2, nous le disions il y a un instant, toute la dynamique de la phrase est orientée *vers Jérusalem*, où sont les *apôtres* (cf. l'emploi des prépositions: πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους... εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ); c'est là que Paul et Barnabé devaient «monter» (ἀναβαίνειν), pour consulter les apôtres. Mais en 8,14 et 16,4, c'est exactement l'inverse: le mouvement va *de Jérusalem* vers la diaspora. Dans ces deux passages, on notera l'orientation *vers la mission*, en dehors du monde juif: d'abord en Samarie (8,14), puis en Syrie, Cilicie et Lycaonie (16,4; cf. 15,41–16,5). Jérusalem n'est plus considérée ici comme le lieu où réside l'autorité apostolique et auquel on va faire appel quand surgit un conflit; elle est plutôt le *point de départ à partir duquel* s'étend et se transmet la «tradition» des apôtres, précisément pour construire au loin l'œuvre missionnaire⁽⁴³⁾. Le nom Ἱεροσόλυμα dans une telle perspective est parfaitement à sa place.

va se maintenir jusqu'à la fin du livre: désormais, *Jérusalem ne sera plus considérée comme le lieu où résident les apôtres* et auquel on a recours. Après 16,4, le mot «apôtre» n'est plus employé dans les Actes.

(41) Ἱερουσαλήμ EGH *al.* La «correction» effectuée en 16,4 dans ces manuscrits est du même genre que celle de 15,4.

(42) J. K. ELLIOTT, «Jerusalem», 465 s.: «At 16,4 the author is again speaking of the apostles and elders in Jerusalem and thus Ἱερουσαλήμ is to be read.»

(43) Autrement dit, si en 15,2 le mouvement est centripète, il est *centrifuge* en 8,14, et plus encore en 16,4 (cf. n. 35). Deux observations sur ce verset ont leur importance: 1) il est très intéressant de constater que, précisément

Nous devons faire un saut de trois chapitres pour arriver au dernier emploi du nom de Jérusalem (Ἱεροσόλυμα) dans la section de Ac 8-19. Pendant son troisième voyage, Paul fit un séjour de plus de deux ans à Éphèse. Il y prêchait chaque jour; et Dieu, par sa main, y accomplissait des miracles. Après l'épisode des exorcistes juifs qui voulaient l'imiter, «Paul prit la décision, dans l'Esprit, de se rendre à Jérusalem, après être passé par la Macédoine et l'Achaïe; il déclarait: quand j'aurai été là-bas, il me faut voir également Rome» (19,21). On notera que Luc emploie ici l'expression πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα⁽⁴⁴⁾, et non pas «monter (ἀναβαίνειν) à Jérusalem», qui est cependant, elle aussi, utilisée plusieurs fois pour Paul (15,2; 21,12.15; 24,11). En disant simplement ici qu'il veut «aller à Jérusalem», Paul dépouille ce voyage de tout caractère solennel (qui accompagne d'ordinaire la *montée à Jérusalem*, quand elle consiste dans un pèlerinage juif ou dans une démarche chrétienne auprès des apôtres)⁽⁴⁵⁾. De plus, le mot Ἱεροσόλυμα lui-même s'insère dans une

en 16,4, fait irruption d'une manière imprévue le mot παραδίδωσαν, terme technique dans le N.T. pour la transmission de la *tradition* (c'est même le seul emploi de παραδίδωμι en ce sens dans le livre des Actes): Paul et Silas, dans les villes où ils passaient, *transmettaient* les décisions qui avaient été prises à Jérusalem. L'image de la *chaîne* de la tradition est très sensible. Cette chaîne part de Jérusalem, mais, de plus en plus, elle se déroule au loin. Cf. M. CARREZ, «L'appel de Paul à César (Ac 25,11): La double appartenance, juive et chrétienne, de la première Église d'après le livre des Actes», *De la Tôrâh au Messie*. Mélanges Henri Cazelles (Paris 1981) 503-510; cf. p. 508: d'après les Actes, Jérusalem est pour l'Église le *centre de la tradition* (mais en ce sens qu'elle est le centre à partir duquel la tradition se répand; cf. Ac 1,8). 2) Un autre point, déjà noté, prend ici tout son poids: 16,4 est le *dernier verset* de tout le livre où figure encore le mot «apôtres». Dorénavant, Jérusalem ne sera plus le centre de la présence apostolique, celui d'où «partait» la *tradition*.

(⁴⁴) Ἱεροσόλυμα est la leçon des meilleurs manuscrits, acceptée par tous les éditeurs. Elliott cependant préfère Ἱερουσαλήμ (avec l'appui de DELPH 13, 25, 389, 440): «the Hebrew form is likely to be original in so far as the thoughts of Paul are being recorded» (p. 466). Mais cette raison est insuffisante, comme on va le voir. De plus, il faut noter que la fréquence même de la formule πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ explique très bien le remplacement du nom profane par le nom religieux. Le changement inverse est beaucoup plus difficile à expliquer.

(⁴⁵) En 20,22, Paul utilise de nouveau la formule, cette fois avec le nom religieux de la ville (πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ): mais là, comme nous le verrons, la résonance de l'expression est toute différente. Dans 25,20 (εἰ βού-

série de noms *profanes* (noms de régions ou de villes: la Macédoine, l'Achaïe, ... Rome), et il est repris un peu plus loin dans une désignation presque banale («*après que j'aurai été là-bas...*»). Ce nom, dès lors, désigne la ville d'un point de vue simplement géographique. Le but du voyage n'est pas indiqué: il n'est pas directement religieux; nous savons que c'était d'y apporter la collecte des églises pauliniennes (cf. 24,17). Mais cette visite n'est qu'une *étape*; dès à présent se manifeste le désir profond de Paul: il veut aller plus loin et voir Rome⁽⁴⁶⁾. Jérusalem étant présentée ici comme une ville que Paul doit visiter comme en passant, et qu'il doit bientôt *quitter* pour poursuivre son voyage missionnaire, Luc l'a désignée par le nom profane Ἱεροσόλυμα. A partir de ce moment s'ouvrent, dans les Actes, une perspective nouvelle et un horizon plus lointain: le départ de l'Apôtre pour la capitale de l'Empire, *Rome*.

III. La dernière «montée» de Paul à Jérusalem (20-24)

Cependant, avant le voyage vers Rome, c'est du dernier séjour de Paul à Jérusalem qu'il est question dans les chapitres 20-24. On doit s'interroger sur le fait, à première vue surprenant, qu'ici de nouveau, et pour la dernière fois, Luc utilise d'une manière massive le nom théologique Ἱερουσαλήμ⁽⁴⁷⁾. A trois reprises, nous l'avons dit, reparaît dans ces chapitres l'expression «monter à Jérusalem» (21,12.15; 24,11), que Paul avait évitée en 19,21. Quel sens faut-il lui donner? Luc ne veut pas insister sur le fait que Paul aurait suivi la pratique juive du pèlerinage au Temple (cf. cependant 24,11), et l'expression ne signifie certainement plus qu'il aurait eu l'intention

λοιτο πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα), c'est le procureur Festus qui expose toute l'affaire de Paul devant le roi Agrippa; d'où le nom profane Ἱεροσόλυμα.

(⁴⁶) Rome, qui n'est mentionnée que cinq fois dans les Actes (18,2; 19,21; 24,11; 28,14.16), l'est ici (19,21) pour la première fois en relation avec Paul; mais dans les trois autres passages également, elle sera toujours présentée dans l'optique paulinienne.

(⁴⁷) Dans Ac 20-24, on compte dix fois Ἱερουσαλήμ (20,22; 21,11.12.13.31; 22,5.17.18; 23,11; 24,11) et quatre fois Ἱεροσόλυμα (20,16; 21,4.15.17; pour les deux premiers de ces textes se posera de nouveau la question critique). Par contre, dans les quatre derniers chapitres des Actes, le nom sémitique ne paraîtra plus qu'une seule fois, tout à fait au début (25,3); dans la suite on ne trouvera plus que le nom hellénistique (dix fois).

de recourir à l'autorité des apôtres (il n'est plus question d'eux dans les Actes après 16,4). Le sens de la formule (quand elle est employée avec Ἱερουσαλήμ) n'est pas à chercher tellement au niveau historique des intentions de *Paul*, mais au plan rédactionnel de l'œuvre de *Luc*. Ce sens est très bien indiqué dans la *TOB*: «Même expression que pour la montée de Jésus à Jérusalem»⁽⁴⁸⁾. Ce rapprochement entre les Actes et le III^e évangile n'est possible que pour l'auteur commun des deux écrits, pas encore dans la réalité *historique*. Paul lui-même se rendait à Jérusalem, mais sans savoir ce qui l'y attendait (20,22). En fait, il allait y devenir «le prisonnier du Christ» (*BJ*) et être condamné à mort par les Juifs. Mais ainsi, le procès et la condamnation de Jésus, racontés par Luc dans l'évangile, se reproduisaient à ses yeux dans la vie de Paul, son témoin. A partir de là, Luc élabore tout un parallélisme entre Jésus et Paul, ce qui explique bien des traits dans la rédaction de ces cinq chapitres, en particulier l'insistance sur Ἱερουσαλήμ, qui, dans le troisième évangile, était présentée comme le lieu où devaient s'accomplir les événements salvifiques de la vie de Jésus.

Dans le déroulement des événements racontés dans ces cinq chapitres, on peut distinguer trois étapes: voyage de Paul d'Éphèse à Jérusalem (20,1-21,16); arrestation et procès de Paul à Jérusalem (21,17-23,22); transfert de Paul de Jérusalem à Césarée (23,23-24,27).

1. Le voyage d'Éphèse à Jérusalem

Dans cette section (20,1-21,16), nous avons de nouveau une alternance des deux noms. Mais le principe dont s'inspire Luc pour écrire tantôt Ἱερουσαλήμ (quatre fois: 20,22; 21,11.12.13), tantôt Ἱεροσόλυμα (trois fois: 20,16; 21,4.15) nous paraît très clair: l'auteur emploie la forme religieuse du nom, quand il s'agit directement d'un événement de la «passion» de l'Apôtre (dans la perspective du parallélisme dont nous avons parlé); au contraire, quand il met en scène

⁽⁴⁸⁾ *TOB*, note z, à Ac 21,15 (les italiques sont de nous). Dans la marge, on renvoie à Lc 9,51 (au sujet du «grand voyage» de Jésus): «Comme arrivait le temps où il allait être enlevé du monde, Jésus, résolument, prit la route de Jérusalem». A la fin du voyage de Jésus, on lit deux fois l'expression «monter à Jérusalem»: une fois avec le nom Ἱεροσόλυμα (Lc 18,31), l'autre fois avec Ἱερουσαλήμ (19,28), avec des nuances nettement différentes; voir notre article cité plus haut (note 4).

d'autres personnes, surtout quand elles manifestent une totale incompréhension pour le sens des événements, il utilise la forme hellénistique. On peut reprendre ici, mais en la précisant, l'idée féconde de Harnack: les «Sections-Nous» (*Wir-Stücke*) jouent un rôle dans le problème de la distinction des deux noms⁽⁴⁹⁾. Ac 20,5-21,18 est la seconde de ces sections; or, quand le sujet de l'action — à tout le moins le sujet logique — est *le groupe* de Paul et de ses compagnons (et Luc est parmi eux), Jérusalem y est désignée comme Ἱεροσόλυμα. Cela veut dire, corrélativement, que l'autre nom, le nom religieux Ἱερουσαλήμ, est réservé aux cas où Luc met directement en lumière la personne et la mission de *Paul lui-même*: ici encore, le nom Ἱερουσαλήμ est lié à la fonction apostolique.

a) Pour vérifier le bien-fondé de cette explication, examinons d'abord les trois cas où l'auteur utilise l'autre nom, Ἱεροσόλυμα.

Dans la péricope 20,13-16, est décrite une des dernières étapes de ce voyage de Paul. Dans les vv. 13.14.15, les verbes sont à la première personne du pluriel; le v. 15 se termine sur ces mots: «...le jour d'après, *nous* arrivions à Milet». Mais dans le verset suivant (où se trouve le mot Ἱεροσόλυμα), les deux verbes (κεκρίκει, ἔσπευδεν) sont au singulier, et *leur sujet grammatical est Paul*. On reste cependant dans une «Section-Nous», car toute cette phrase sert uniquement à expliquer (cf. γάρ au début) pourquoi *tout le groupe* s'était rendu directement de Troas à Milet, sans faire escale à Éphèse: «Il (Paul) n'avait qu'une hâte: être, si possible, pour le jour de la Pentecôte à Jérusalem» (v. 16c). C'est un de ces cas, et on le comprend, où les critiques sont divisés sur la leçon à suivre. D'après la règle indiquée plus haut, nous optons pour la forme hellénistique εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα⁽⁵⁰⁾. Le contexte favorise entièrement cette option: le *su-*

(49) Il faut, disons-nous, préciser l'idée de Harnack: lui-même se plaçait encore au niveau de la critique littéraire (la distinction des sources); nous aussi, nous reconnaissons l'importance des «Sections-Nous», mais du point de vue sémiotique et herméneutique: nous nous demandons comment «fonctionnent» ces deux passages en «nous» dans l'économie du récit, et comment ils produisent un «sens» dans leur contexte immédiat.

(50) Voir plus haut p. 155. Voici les données pour les deux variantes: Ἱεροσόλυμα (BC 25, 33, 389) est la leçon suivie par un grand nombre de critiques (Westcott-Hort, Weiss, Vogels, Jacquier, Merk, Clark, Kilpatrick, Nestle-Aland, GNT); mais Ἱερουσαλήμ (P⁷⁴ SAΨE 33, 1898) est préféré par Tischendorf, Bover-O'Callaghan, Elliott. C'est la mention de la fête de la Pen-

jet logique de toute la péricope (même au v. 16) n'est pas Paul, mais ce « nous » qui représente tout ensemble l'auteur du livre, Paul et ses compagnons. Si Luc parle ici de Paul, c'est *du point de vue du groupe*. Le texte de 20,16 ne vise pas à nous donner une information sur la mission de l'Apôtre; c'est tout simplement une *notice de voyage*: pour expliquer l'itinéraire insolite suivi par tout le groupe, l'auteur rappelle une décision prise par le responsable principal. Dans cette optique, il était normal, pour parler du terme du voyage, d'utiliser le nom géographique Ἱεροσόλυμα.

Après diverses étapes, les voyageurs arrivent à Tyr où ils trouvent les disciples de cette communauté (21,3-4); mais ceux-ci dissuadèrent Paul de se rendre à Jérusalem⁽⁵¹⁾. Les versions traduisent d'ordinaire: « Poussés par l'Esprit, ils disaient à Paul de ne pas *monter* à Jérusalem ». Mais ce n'est pas le sens du verbe qu'on lit ici: ἐπιβαίνειν (pas ἀναβαίνειν!); accompagné, comme dans ce verset, d'un substantif désignant un territoire (ville ou province; cf. encore 20,18; 25,1), ce verbe signifie: entrer en (dans), mettre les pieds à, fouler. Nous traduisons donc: « ... ils disaient à Paul de ne pas *mettre les pieds* à Jérusalem »⁽⁵²⁾. La nuance d'hostilité est manifeste; et elle explique parfaitement que Luc ait employé ici le nom profane de la ville (cf. de même en Lc 13,22; 19,28)⁽⁵³⁾.

En Ac 21,15 enfin, Luc raconte la fin du voyage: « Après ces

tecôte qui peut avoir porté plusieurs scribes à remplacer le nom profane de la ville par le nom biblique et juif Ἱερουσαλήμ. Mais, étant donné que Ἱεροσόλυμα est solidement attesté, il est probable que cette forme plus « difficile » est originale.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Tous les éditeurs lisent ici Ἱεροσόλυμα (avec BSACE); Elliott cependant préfère Ἱερουσαλήμ, qui est la leçon de la koinè (LPH). Comme nous le disons plus loin dans le texte, le contenu du verset impose presque le choix de la forme profane.

⁽⁵²⁾ Même traduction dans Bover-O'Callaghan: « ... que no *pusiese pie* en Jerusalén ». Voici quelques exemples de ἐπιβαίνειν εἰς (ἐπὶ), suivi d'un nom de province ou de ville (souvent avec une nuance d'hostilité): dans les LXX, Mi 5,4.5; dans les textes profanes, DIODORE DE SICILE, 14,84: (Agésilas) μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως ἐπέβαινεν εἰς Βοιωτίαν...; P. Flor., 275,22; P. Ox., 1155,3-4.

⁽⁵³⁾ La nuance d'hostilité ou d'animosité qu'exprime la formule « mettre les pieds à ... » peut être illustrée par ce passage de A. DE MUSSET: « ... je sors de cette maison, ... on ne m'y reverra de ma vie, ... je n'ai qu'un regret, c'est d'y avoir jamais mis les pieds » (*Il ne faut jurer de rien*, Acte II, scène XIV: Théâtre complet [Bibl. de la Pléiade], Paris 1958) 585.

quelques jours, ... *nous* sommes montés vers Jérusalem (ἀνεβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα)». Cette fois, indubitablement, Luc emploie ἀναβαίνειν. Cependant, de ce seul fait on ne peut pas conclure que le nom biblique serait ici mieux à sa place. Car il s'agit, cette fois encore, non pas de Paul, mais de tout le groupe; et surtout, pour les compagnons de Paul, cette montée à Jérusalem n'avait rien de spécifiquement religieux. Les détails donnés par l'auteur sont de fait d'ordre *profane*: le verset 21,15 est une *notice de voyage*, comme 20,16 (on peut même parler d'une sorte d'inclusion entre les deux textes); l'auteur décrit ici l'*arrivée* du groupe à Jérusalem (cf. aussi 21,17a); et Luc a même le souci de préciser que lui et ses compagnons furent «emmenés *loger*» (21,16) chez un disciple des premiers jours, Mnason de Chypre.

b) Mais il nous faut maintenant interpréter les quatre passages de cette même section où Luc utilise le nom religieux de la ville (20,22; 21,11.12.13).

Le premier texte fait partie du discours d'adieu que Paul, à Milet, adressa aux anciens de l'église d'Éphèse (20,22-25): «Maintenant, enchaîné par l'Esprit, me voici *en route pour Jérusalem*» (v. 22). Quelle est la résonance de cet emploi du nom Ἱερουσαλήμ? Remarquons tout d'abord qu'il s'agit bien, cette fois, de Paul lui-même. Et divers indices montrent que, pour Luc, ici commence le parallélisme théologique entre les tribulations de l'Apôtre et la passion de Jésus⁽⁵⁴⁾. Sans doute, c'est beaucoup plus tôt, à Éphèse, que Paul avait pris la décision de se rendre à Jérusalem (19,21); mais là, il avait encore l'intention de pousser plus loin, jusqu'à Rome. Ici à Milet, après le voyage aller et retour par la Grèce et la Macédoine, l'horizon s'assombrit et se concentre maintenant sur Jérusalem. Ce rétrécissement de l'optique explique qu'après l'expression πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα en 19,21, qui décrivait le vaste projet de Paul à Éphèse, de se rendre en Macédoine, en Achaïe, à Jérusalem et enfin à Rome⁽⁵⁵⁾, nous trouvons, dans le discours de Milet, la formule

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Plusieurs études récentes ont analysé ce parallélisme; cf. surtout W. RADL, «'Paulus Traditus'. Jesus und sein Missionar im lukanischen Doppelwerk», *Erbe und Auftrag* 50 (1974) 163-167; Id., *Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk* (Europ. Hochschulschr. XXIII/49; Bern-Frankfurt M. 1975); A. J. MATTILL, «The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H. H. Evans Reconsidered», *NT* 17 (1975) 15-46.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Voir plus haut p. 173.

directement religieuse πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ (20,22). La perspective n'est plus celle de la mission apostolique, mais d'un discours d'adieu: Paul sait que chaînes et tribulations l'attendent (v. 23)⁽⁵⁶⁾. Connaissant les complots des Juifs (v. 19), il entrevoit l'éventualité de sa mort prochaine (vv. 24.29.38). Ainsi apparaît la ressemblance de son cas avec celui de Jésus. C'est ce que Luc a mis en lumière par les mots πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, qui, dans le III^e évangile, évoquent le grand thème de la «marche» de Jésus vers Jérusalem, vers le lieu de sa mort et de sa glorification. Une synopse suffit à faire voir le parallélisme⁽⁵⁷⁾:

Lc (Jésus)	Ac (Paul)
9,51 τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερου- σαλήμ	20,22 δεδεμένος... πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερου- σαλήμ
9,53 πορευόμενον εἰς Ἱερου- σαλήμ	
17,11 πορεύεσθαι... εἰς Ἱερου- σαλήμ	

Si, pour Jésus, le «cheminement vers Jérusalem» commençait en Lc 9,51, on peut dire que le voyage semblable de Paul avait son point de départ en Ac 20,22⁽⁵⁸⁾.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Le texte occidental ajoute: ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, texte que nous n'avons pas retenu comme authentique. L'emploi du nom hellénistique à cet endroit reflète bien la tendance du codex D (cf. note 31).

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Cf. W. RADL, *Paulus und Jesus*, 149-150: «Auf dem Weg nach Jerusalem». Pourtant dans son article: «'Paulus Traditus'», 164, l'auteur met Lc 9,51 en correspondance, non pas avec Ac 20,22 (Paul à Milet), mais avec Ac 19,21 (Paul à Éphèse); il écrit: «In beiden Fällen wird nun — es ist ein wichtiger Einschnitt im Aufbau des Buches — Jerusalem als die Stadt des Leidens mit aller Entschlossenheit in den Blick genommen». Cependant, cela vaut plutôt pour Ac 20,22. L'auteur n'a pas observé qu'en 19,21 il y avait Ἱεροσόλυμα, mais seulement en 20,22 Ἱερουσαλήμ. Pour W. RADL, il est vrai, la différence entre les deux noms ne semble guère avoir d'importance (*op. cit.*, 108, n. 4).

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Un autre point de contact entre les deux «voyages» est peut-être suggéré par l'emploi significatif du même verbe τελειοῦν pour Jésus et pour Paul: τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι... Ἱερουσαλήμ (Lc 13,32-33); εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ... τελειῶσαι τὸν δρόμον μου (Ac 20,22.24). Est-ce une rencontre purement fortuite?

Les premiers mots du verset 20,22 ont eux aussi leur importance: Paul se rend dans la Ville Sainte «enchaîné par l'Esprit». Les mots τῷ πνεύματι (cf. déjà 19,21 : ἐν τῷ πνεύματι), qui indiquent que Paul part pour Jérusalem poussé par l'Esprit⁽⁵⁹⁾, sont à rapprocher de l'évangile de Luc où (ἐν) τῷ πνεύματι est appliqué à Jésus (Lc 4,1; 10,21). La formule, il est vrai, n'y est pas utilisée à propos du grand voyage de Jésus: mais pour ce voyage, Luc se sert plusieurs fois du terme équivalent «il faut»; ce δεῖ désigne la divine nécessité à laquelle est soumise aussi bien la «marche» de Jésus vers Jérusalem (13,33) que sa passion et sa résurrection (9,22; 17,25; cf. 24,7.26.44). Le parallélisme est indéniable, entre Jésus, «en route vers Jérusalem», parce que «il le faut» (selon le plan de Dieu), et Paul, qui, lui aussi, se met «en route pour Jérusalem», parce que l'Esprit l'y contraint.

Il nous reste à analyser trois textes dans la section 20,1–21,16: ce sont trois versets consécutifs (21,11.12.13) qui forment un tout. Ici de nouveau, les ressemblances avec le III^e évangile sont indéniables. Le v.11 constitue ce que l'on pourrait appeler «l'annonce de la passion» de Paul; elle est parallèle à la troisième annonce de la passion de Jésus en Luc 18,32⁽⁶⁰⁾. Les contacts entre les deux textes sont manifestes:

Lc 18,32 (Jésus)	Ac 21,11 (Paul)
εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ	ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ
... παραδοθήσεται	... παραδώσουσιν
γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν	εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν

Dans les deux cas, il s'agit d'une prédiction (cf. les verbes au futur): celle de Jésus, sur sa propre destinée, pendant la montée à Jérusalem; celle du prophète Agabus, à Césarée, sur ce qui attendait Paul à Jérusalem. Dans cette prophétie au sujet de Paul, tout se ramène au fait que «les Juifs le *livreront* aux mains des *païens*». Cependant, d'après le récit de Luc lui-même (cf. 21,30-36), c'est plutôt l'inverse qui s'est passé: le peuple juif voulait tuer Paul, et ce

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Dans les Actes, ces mots (ἐν) τῷ πνεύματι se trouvent uniquement appliqués à Paul.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ W. RADL, *Paulus und Jesus*, 5. Kapitel (pp. 133-158): «Die Leidensweissagungen»; il étudie Ac 20,22-25 et 21,4.10-11, en les comparant avec les annonces de la passion dans le III^e évangile. Dans la marge de Ac 21,11-12, la TOB renvoie à Lc 18,32.

sont les soldats romains qui le mirent en sûreté. Cela montre qu'en 21,11 Luc a plutôt repris, presque dans les mêmes termes, le thème que, dans son évangile (18,32: Lc diffère ici de Mt/Mc), il avait formulé au sujet de Jésus: «il sera livré aux païens»⁽⁶¹⁾. C'est un exemple frappant de la «Parallelisierung» entre les Actes et le III^e évangile⁽⁶²⁾. En raison de ce parallélisme avec la destinée de Jésus, Ἱερουσαλήμ, appliqué à Paul en Ac 21,11, a donc une résonance profondément religieuse.

Le thème se poursuit dans les deux versets suivants. Après la prédiction d'Agabus, la réaction des amis de l'apôtre fut immédiate: «A ces mots, ... nous l'avons supplié de ne pas monter à Jérusalem» (21,12). Ce verset a exactement la même fonction que le passage du III^e évangile (18,34; cf. déjà Lc 9,45) qui exprimait la totale incompréhension des disciples devant l'annonce de la passion de Jésus. Cependant, il nous faut comparer attentivement ce texte avec le verset relativement proche et apparemment semblable de Ac 21,4 (que nous avons déjà expliqué): μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (21,4); μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ (21,12). Du fait même de cet emploi des deux noms de Jérusalem dans le même contexte, J. Wanke a cru pouvoir conclure qu'il est vain de vouloir donner au premier un sens simplement géographique et au deuxième un sens religieux⁽⁶³⁾. Mais il n'a pas observé que 21,4 est un texte de type narratif et historique, comme nous l'avons expliqué plus haut, et que le verset 21,12 a une fonction théologique: il exprime l'*inintelligence* devant le mystère, devant la prophétie que vient d'accorder l'Esprit Saint (cf. le verset précédent). De plus, dans le premier cas, Luc utilise ἐπιβαίνειν, dans le second, ἀναβαίνειν. La différence est importante. Seul le deuxième texte met réellement en œuvre le thème théologique de la «montée à Jérusalem», même si celle-ci est présentée négativement à travers l'incompréhension des amis de Paul. Cette «montée» de l'Apôtre a donc fondamentalement le même sens

(61) W. RADL, *op. cit.*, 156. Il est intéressant de noter que le thème est repris, mais avec des modifications, en 28,17, où Paul, devant les notables juifs de Rome, raconte ce qui s'est passé: «A Jérusalem, j'ai été livré aux mains des Romains». Mais ici, la formule (de type narratif) prend une couleur plus historique: «les païens» sont devenus «les Romains»; et Ἱερουσαλήμ est changé en Ἱεροσόλυμα.

(62) L'expression est de W. Radl, dans le titre de son dernier chapitre (p. 369).

(63) J. WANKE, *Die Emmauserzählung*, 26.

religieux que la «montée à Jérusalem» de Jésus (Lc 18,31), dont l'annonce avait provoqué, elle aussi, une réaction de refus de la part des disciples. Dans sa réponse, Paul reproche à ses amis leur inintelligence, et déclare qu'il prend pleinement à son compte la prédiction du prophète: «Qu'avez-vous à pleurer et à me briser le cœur? Je suis prêt, moi, non seulement à être lié, mais à *mourir à Jérusalem pour le nom du Seigneur Jésus*» (21,13; cf. Lc 18,33). On reste bien dans le contexte d'une prédiction des tribulations de l'Apôtre, et dans la perspective de sa mort éventuelle pour le Christ.

2. Paul à Jérusalem

Dans cette deuxième section (21,17-23,22), si nous omettons le verset d'introduction dont nous avons déjà parlé (21,17), nous trouvons cinq emplois de Ἱερουσαλήμ (21,31; 22,5.17.18; 23,11), et nulle part Ἱεροσόλυμα. Luc y décrit l'arrestation de Paul, sa harangue aux Juifs et sa comparution devant le Sanhédrin. Sur plusieurs points, ces chapitres présentent des points de contact avec le récit lucanien de la passion de Jésus. Les cinq mentions de Jérusalem étant étroitement liées à la mission de l'Apôtre, il est normal que Luc utilise uniquement la forme religieuse du nom.

En Ac 21,31, il raconte que l'on communiqua au tribun de la cohorte cette nouvelle: «Tout Jérusalem est sens dessus dessous!» La raison était que le peuple avait été ameuté par les Juifs contre Paul; celui-ci se trouvait dans le Temple, mais la foule le traîna dehors et «cherchait à le mettre à mort». La situation est semblable à celle de Jésus, pendant sa période d'enseignement dans le Temple, au terme de son «grand voyage» (Lc 19,47a-21,38): «les grands prêtres et les scribes cherchaient à le faire périr, et aussi les chefs du peuple» (Lc 19,47b). Un peu plus loin dans les Actes, Luc dit que le peuple tout entier vociféra contre Paul: «A mort!» (αἶρε αὐτόν, Ac 21,36); ici de nouveau, nous percevons l'écho des cris de la foule contre Jésus, au cours du procès romain: «A mort cet homme!» (αἶρε τοῦτον, Lc 23,18: diff. Mt/Mc).

Les trois textes suivants font partie du plaidoyer de Paul devant les Juifs. Il leur raconte sa vocation. La mention de Jérusalem en jalonne les deux étapes principales. Au v. 5, Paul rappelle, que, comme persécuteur, il avait reçu mission «d'enchaîner et d'amener à Jérusalem, pour les faire punir», les frères qui étaient à Damas. Mais sur le chemin de Damas survint l'événement qui allait bouleverser toute son existence. Après un séjour auprès d'Ananie, Paul

revint à Jérusalem (v. 17); mais pendant sa prière dans le Temple, le Seigneur lui apparut et lui dit: «Vite, *quitte Jérusalem* (ἔξελε... ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ) sans tarder...» (v. 18). Et le Seigneur ajouta: «Va, c'est au loin, vers les nations païennes, que je vais, moi, t'envoyer» (v. 21). Dans ces trois textes, le nom de la Ville Sainte est étroitement lié à la mission de l'Apôtre. Luc en souligne ici deux aspects essentiels: conformément au schéma de Ac 1,8, Paul reçoit sa mission du Seigneur lui-même, et il la reçoit à Jérusalem; mais il doit maintenant *quitter Jérusalem*, et s'engager au loin, en terre païenne, pour être désormais le témoin du Christ «devant tous les hommes» (22,15). Depuis tout un temps déjà s'était réalisée la séparation entre le groupe apostolique et Jérusalem⁽⁶⁴⁾; maintenant, Paul lui aussi va quitter la ville sans retour.

Un dernier texte, d'une importance décisive, est comme un point d'orgue sur tout ce développement: «La nuit suivante, le Seigneur se présenta à Paul et lui dit: 'Courage! Tu viens de rendre témoignage à ma cause à Jérusalem; ainsi il faut qu'à Rome aussi tu témoignes'» (23,11). L'expression «il faut» (δεῖ), si caractéristique pour la théologie lucanienne du plan de Dieu, se trouvait déjà en 19, 21, en liaison avec le départ pour Rome: «*il faut*, disait Paul, que je voie Rome». Elle reparait ici, mais dans un cadre plus solennel; le Seigneur lui-même exprime à l'Apôtre sa volonté expresse: «il faut» que désormais il lui rende témoignage à Rome. Ainsi, les derniers liens sont rompus, qui rattachaient Paul de Tarse à la terre d'Israël et à la ville de Jérusalem. A travers l'Apôtre, le message chrétien, parti de Jérusalem (cf. 1,8), s'ouvre définitivement à sa destinée universelle.

3. De Jérusalem à Césarée

Dans cette section (23,23-24,27), Luc raconte le transfert de Paul à Césarée, le procès devant le procureur Félix et la captivité de Paul, qui se prolongera pendant deux ans. Il n'y est question qu'une seule fois de Jérusalem. Le verset se trouve au début de la plaidoirie de Paul devant le gouverneur romain. L'avocat Tertullus l'avait accusé d'avoir provoqué des émeutes parmi les communautés juives, et d'avoir voulu profaner le Temple (14,5-6). Paul répond en disant que personne n'avait pu le voir en train d'ameuter la foule, et que, s'il

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Voir note 40.

s'était rendu au Temple quelques jours avant, c'était uniquement dans un but religieux: «Il n'y a pas plus de douze jours que je suis monté à Jérusalem (ἀνέβην... εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ) pour adorer» (24,11). Dans cette phrase, où c'est Paul lui-même qui rappelle son pèlerinage au Temple et son séjour à Jérusalem, l'utilisation du nom biblique de la ville était obvie.

IV. De Césarée à Rome (25–28)

Mais nous voici arrivés à la dernière section du livre des Actes (25–28). Comme nous l'indiquions à la fin de l'introduction, on n'y rencontre plus qu'une seule fois Ἱερουσαλήμ (25,3); la forme courante utilisée dans les dix autres passages est Ἱεροσόλυμα (25,1.7.9.15.20.24; 26,4.10.20; 28,17).

a) Au début du chapitre 25, Luc décrit une dernière tentative des Juifs pour se débarrasser de Paul. Festus, le nouveau procureur, était venu pour quelques jours à Jérusalem. Les autorités juives en profitèrent pour lui demander «le transfert de Paul à Jérusalem; ils préparaient un guet-apens pour le supprimer en chemin» (25,3). L'emploi de Ἱερουσαλήμ, cette toute dernière fois, peut se comprendre: c'est à Jérusalem même que se déroule ce qu'on peut appeler le dernier acte de la «passion» de Paul. Cette démarche sournoise des Juifs est un ultime effort pour mettre à exécution ce qu'ils avaient projeté plusieurs fois auparavant (cf. ἀποκτείνειν: 21,31; 23,12.14; ἀναιρεῖν: 9,23.24.29; 23,15.21.27). Il n'est pas indifférent que le verbe «supprimer» (ἀναιρεῖν), utilisé ici, ait été employé à diverses reprises par Luc pour parler de la mise à mort de Jésus par les Juifs (Lc 22,2; [cf. 23,32]; Ac 2,23; 10,39; 13,28).

b) Les autres mentions de Jérusalem (Ἱεροσόλυμα) dans ces chapitres ont une portée différente: la ville y est considérée d'un point de vue simplement historique, géographique ou politique⁽⁶⁵⁾. La plupart de ces textes nous situent dans le déroulement du procès de Paul à Césarée, d'abord devant le gouverneur Festus, puis devant le roi Agrippa et Bérénice.

En 25,1, le bref voyage du gouverneur est raconté en ces termes: «Après son arrivée dans sa province, Festus monta à Jérusalem, de Césarée». Le nom profane de Jérusalem est placé entre deux termes

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Cf. les bonnes remarques de J. KUDASIEWICZ, «Nazwy Jeruzalem», 29-30.

géographiques, «province» et «Césarée», et il s'agit ici du procureur romain, avec l'indication de sa résidence, Césarée: cela montre clairement que le voyage à Jérusalem est un déplacement administratif. Après le retour de Festus à Césarée commence le procès. De nouvelles accusations sont portées contre Paul par «les Juifs descendus de Jérusalem» (25,7). Le contexte est politisé: *comme Festus*, qui était «*descendu* à Césarée» (25,6), ces Juifs, eux aussi, étaient «*descendus* de Jérusalem»⁽⁶⁶⁾. Dans les quatre versets suivants qu'il nous faut examiner, c'est toujours Festus qui parle: il propose d'abord à Paul de transférer le procès à Jérusalem (25,9); mais Paul refuse: «Je suis devant le tribunal de *l'empereur*, c'est donc là que je dois être jugé... J'en appelle à *l'empereur*» (25,10-11). Le point de vue juridique et politique est ici on ne peut plus clair. Les séances suivantes du procès se tiennent en présence du roi Agrippa; Festus y rappelle le cours des événements: son propre séjour à Jérusalem (25,15), la proposition faite à Paul de déplacer le lieu du procès et d'aller à Jérusalem dans ce but (25,20), enfin la démarche des Juifs à son tribunal, d'abord à Jérusalem, enfin à Césarée (25,24).

Puis vient le discours de Paul lui-même devant Agrippa, avec un nouveau récit de sa vocation. Le contexte administratif et juridique du procès de Césarée suffit à expliquer que Jérusalem soit désignée trois fois avec son nom géographique: Paul en effet rappelle d'abord sa jeunesse, passée au milieu de sa nation (ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου) à Jérusalem, où il vivait comme pharisien (26,4-5); puis sa lutte contre les chrétiens, à Jérusalem, et la rage qu'il mettait à les poursuivre «jusque dans les villes étrangères» (26,10-11)⁽⁶⁷⁾; enfin, après avoir reçu l'ordre du Seigneur d'annoncer aux hommes qu'ils avaient à se convertir et à se tourner vers Dieu, il entreprit sa longue prédication

(⁶⁶) En comparant 25,1 avec 25,6-7, on peut observer le renversement des orientations:

	Césarée		Jérusalem
v. 1	(ἀπό)	→	(εἰς)
vv. 6-7	(εἰς)	←	(ἀπό)

(⁶⁷) On observera le retournement de perspective par rapport au récit qu'il avait fait devant les Juifs de *Jérusalem*, où le mouvement était «centripète»:

22,5 : de Damas à *Jérusalem* (Ἱερουσαλήμ);

22,17: «de retour à *Jérusalem* (Ἱερουσαλήμ)».

Ici, à *Césarée*, la perspective est «centrifuge»:

26,10-11: de *Jérusalem* (Ἱεροσόλυμα), «jusque dans les villes étrangères».

missionnaire, d'abord à *Damas*, à *Jérusalem* et en *Judée*, et puis aux *nations païennes* (26,20) ⁽⁶⁸⁾.

Le procès se termine par une réflexion d'Agrippa à Festus: «Cet homme pouvait être relâché, s'il n'en avait appelé à l'empereur» (26,32).

Le voyage vers l'Italie est longuement décrit (27,1-28,15). Trois jours après son arrivée à Rome, Paul invite les notables Juifs et leur déclare: «Frères, (...) je suis prisonnier depuis qu'à Jérusalem j'ai été livré aux mains des Romains» (28,17). C'est la toute dernière mention du nom de Jérusalem dans les Actes. Quoique Paul parle à des Juifs, on comprend très bien que la forme utilisée ici soit le nom hellénistique: dans ce contexte d'une rencontre de l'Apôtre des Gentils avec des Juifs de la diaspora, Luc n'avait plus aucune raison, en disant que Paul, à Jérusalem, avait été «livré aux mains des Romains», de donner de ce fait l'interprétation théologique qu'il en avait présentée en 21,11, au cours du voyage de Paul vers la Ville Sainte ⁽⁶⁹⁾. Vu de Rome, cet événement n'avait plus que la valeur d'un rappel historique. Ce que Paul voulait expliquer aux Juifs de Rome, c'était pourquoi il avait dû faire appel à l'empereur et en était ainsi venu à entrer en contact avec eux. Jérusalem, désormais, n'est plus qu'une ville profane, à laquelle sont attachés les souvenirs du passé.

Conclusion

L'ensemble de ces analyses permet de voir clairement pourquoi l'auteur du livre des Actes a désigné Jérusalem par deux noms différents.

Le nom biblique Ἱερουσαλήμ avait, pour Luc, une forte résonance religieuse, mais dans un sens en grande partie nouveau. Pour tous les premiers chrétiens, certes, comme pour les Juifs, Jérusalem était encore «Jérusalem la Sainte», le centre religieux de la prière et du culte (cf. «monter à Jérusalem»). Mais, pour Luc, elle l'était surtout parce qu'elle était l'endroit où Jésus, le Seigneur, avait accompli son œuvre de salut, et parce que, après l'Ascension et la Pentecôte,

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Ici encore, la perspective est «centrifuge» (missionnaire) comme aux versets 10-11 (cf. la note précédente): Jérusalem est mise en série avec Damas, la Judée et les nations païennes.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Voir plus haut p. 179-180.

elle resta pendant plusieurs années la ville des apôtres: elle était le centre d'où partait la première mission chrétienne, celui aussi où les missionnaires revenaient consulter le groupe apostolique. Le caractère «sacré» de Jérusalem redevient particulièrement sensible, dans les Actes, lorsque Paul, au terme de ses voyages missionnaires, y connaît sa «passion» et y fait pour ainsi dire l'expérience de ce qu'avait été la passion du Christ. C'est donc tout d'abord l'aspect «apostolique» de Ἱερουσαλήμ qui lui donne son caractère religieux; mais en définitive, cette note apostolique elle-même n'est que la transparence d'une symbolique christologique: si la présence des apôtres confère à Jérusalem une valeur religieuse, c'est parce qu'ils y sont les témoins du Christ ⁽⁷⁰⁾.

Après le «départ» du Christ (cf. Lc 9,31: ἔξοδον), et quand les apôtres, à leur tour, eurent quitté Jérusalem, cette ville, pour les premiers chrétiens, perdait son caractère religieux: elle n'était plus que Ἱεροσόλυμα. Disons avec W. D. Davies: «C'est Luc (...) qui révèle le plus clairement, peut-être, que l'Évangile, bien qu'issu d'un lieu précis, n'est lié à aucun lieu» ⁽⁷¹⁾. C'est la condition même de l'universalisme chrétien. Il serait donc excessif et faux de prétendre que le voyage paulinien de Jérusalem à Rome signifie, pour Luc, que Rome prend dorénavant la place de Jérusalem. Nous adoptons pleinement la conclusion nuancée de W. D. Davies: «Il est vrai que le centre d'intérêt se déplace de Jérusalem à Rome au fur et à mesure que le livre avance: pour Luc, Paul s'est en effet libéré de la Terre. Mais ce serait rendre Luc incohérent avec lui-même que de suggérer qu'il entendait par Rome davantage qu'un centre géographique crucial pour le témoignage rendu à l'Évangile, qu'il y voyait, en bref, le fondement d'une mystique» ⁽⁷²⁾. Luc n'a aucunement inauguré une mystique chrétienne de Rome; mais il faut dire avec la même netteté: Luc enlève tout fondement, pour les chrétiens, à une mystique de

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Cf., dans le même sens, mais d'une manière plus globale, la conclusion de W. D. DAVIES, «Jérusalem et la terre dans la tradition chrétienne», *RHPR* 55 (1975) 491-533: «On ne peut douter de la signification capitale de Jérusalem aux yeux de Luc: c'est le lieu où culmine tout le mystère de Jésus et où a pris naissance l'Église des témoins qui a surgi de la résurrection» (p. 514).

⁽⁷¹⁾ *Ibid.* Mais ces deux aspects de Jérusalem, W. D. Davies ne les a pas rattachés aux deux noms différents de la ville, comme nous l'avons fait.

⁽⁷²⁾ *Ibid.*, 515.

Jérusalem. Concluons, ici encore, avec W. D. Davies: «Théologiquement, notre centre est désormais 'en Christ', et (...) il n'est pas conditionné géographiquement»⁽⁷³⁾. Voilà, exactement décrite, la perspective de Luc; telle est aussi la perspective chrétienne⁽⁷⁴⁾.

Institut Biblique Pontifical
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

I. DE LA POTTERIE S. J.

SUMMARY

Why, in the Acts of the Apostles, is Jerusalem given two different names (Ἱερουσαλήμ, 36 times; Ἱεροσόλυμα, 23 times)? The solution offered here is of theological order: 1) The biblical name Ἱερουσαλήμ, for Luke, designates the Holy City where *Jesus* has accomplished his work of salvation, and also the place of the *Apostles'* presence (later the place of Paul's trial, parallel to the trial of Jesus). 2) Luke employs the hellenistic name Ἱεροσόλυμα in the perspective of Mission and Diaspora, or when the context is merely profane, or once more, at the end of the book, when he deals with Jerusalem after the definitive departure of the Apostles.

⁽⁷³⁾ *Ibid.*, 533, fin de la note 75. Cf. au début de cette même note, l'opinion différente de E. JACOB, dans son ouvrage *Israël dans la perspective biblique* (Strasbourg 1968) 351. Nous partageons les réserves de W. D. Davies sur sa façon de voir.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Voir par exemple la position très nette de saint GRÉGOIRE DE NYSSE (*Ep.*, 2: PG, 46, 1009-1016): il critique les croyants qui accordent trop d'importance aux pèlerinages à Jérusalem (Ἱεροσόλυμα) et aux autres lieux saints, comme si le Christ et l'Esprit n'étaient pas présents en tout lieu (cf. Jn 3,8; 4,21).

The Colossian Mystics

No reconstruction of the heresy or error which prompted the writing of the epistle to the Colossians has yet been offered that has won the assent of the majority of scholars. The problems faced by the exegete here are particularly difficult because of the allusive and abbreviated language of the author (e.g. 2,18). Since F. C. Baur, numerous hypotheses have been advanced. It has been suggested that the author used the vocabulary of his opponents in his polemic or was himself influenced by this new vocabulary and so recast his theology in terms of their language and concepts⁽¹⁾. The present study will explore an approach that has not been adequately investigated. The study is divided into three parts. In the first part crit-

(1) The question as to what extent the author of the epistle adopted the language and concepts of the Colossian errorists has led to debate over the question of the genuineness of its authorship. H.-M. SCHENKE, "Der Widerstreit gnostischer und kirchlicher Christologie im Spiegel des Kolosserbriefes", *ZTK* 61 (1964) 391-403, reached the conclusion that the epistle is post-Pauline and was penned by a Gnostic pupil. After an analysis of the Pauline parallels E. P. SANDERS, "Literary Dependence in Colossians", *JBL* 85 (1966) 28-45, concludes that there is evidence of conflation in Colossians, especially in the first half of the epistle, which would argue for pseudonymity. E. LOHSE, *Colossians and Philemon* (Philadelphia 1971) 84-91, 165-167, 175-183, concludes that, although the language and style of the epistle are Pauline, its theology suggests post-Pauline development. The problem in analyzing the Colossian error from the perspective that the epistle is in fact pseudonymous is that many of the significant verbal parallels in Colossians and other incontestably Pauline epistles are not regarded as genuine theological parallels (e.g. στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Col 2,8.20 and Gal 4,3.9). As such, these verbal parallels are not considered very helpful in exegeting Colossians. The irony here is that verbal parallels taken from non-Pauline, and often non-Jewish, sources (usually of uncertain date and origin) are regarded as being closer theological parallels to Colossians than the verbal parallels taken from the other Pauline epistles themselves. In this study the question of authorship will be left open, for if it can be shown that Pauline and other Jewish parallels clarify the Colossian error then this fact in itself would suggest the epistle's authenticity.

ical scholarship on the question of the Colossian error will be surveyed. Special attention will be given to recent significant publications which have broken away from long-standing positions. In the second part an analysis of the contents of the epistle will be given. The purpose here is to isolate those passages which are truly polemical in nature. In the third part these polemical portions of the epistle will be studied and from them a picture of the error will be presented.

I. Previous Studies

One century ago J. B. Lightfoot suggested that the Colossian error was a form of incipient Jewish Gnosticism typified by the Essene sect described by Josephus, and possibly influenced by Gnosticizing Stoic and Pythagorean philosophy⁽²⁾. Thus, Lightfoot concluded that the Colossian error was an amalgam of Judaism (i.e. Essene) and Paganism (i.e. incipient Gnosticism) in which great emphasis was placed upon mysticism and asceticism⁽³⁾.

The next major essay written concerning the Colossian error was produced by M. Dibelius after excavating the temple of Apollo at Claros⁽⁴⁾. Dibelius analyzed a series of inscriptions found there and the initiation rites described by Apuleius in Book XI of *Metamorphoses*⁽⁵⁾. He was convinced that Col 2,18 was the key to the error and that the word ἐμβατεύειν ("to enter") was to be understood as a technical term approximating μύειν ("to initiate")⁽⁶⁾. Therefore, according to Dibelius, the Colossian errorists advocated the practice of initiation for the Christians⁽⁷⁾. Dibelius went so far as to suggest

(2) J. B. LIGHTFOOT, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (London 1879) 73-113; reprinted in F. O. FRANCIS and W. A. MEEKS (eds.), *Conflict at Colossae* (Missoula 1975) 13-59, see pp. 15-23. Notes refer to reprint.

(3) LIGHTFOOT, *Colossians*, 32-33.

(4) DIBELIUS, "Die Isisweihe bei Apuleius und verwandte Initiations-Riten", *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 8 (1917), reprinted in FRANCIS and MEEKS, 61-121. Notes refer to reprint.

(5) DIBELIUS, "Isisweihe", 86. For a critical edition of *Metamorphoses* see J. G. GRIFFITHS, *The Isis-Book* (Leiden 1976).

(6) DIBELIUS, "Isisweihe", 86-88.

(7) DIBELIUS, "Isisweihe", 90-91.

that there was an established priesthood at Colossae that actively sought to bring Christian converts into their Gnostic mystery as added protection against the "elements" (8).

G. Bornkamm redirected the discussion away from Dibelius' almost totally Pagan background to a Gnosticism of a Jewish origin in some ways similar to Lightfoot's reconstruction (9). He argued that the basis of the Colossian error was a mystery cult, but, unlike Dibelius's conclusion, this was to be found in the context of the church itself (10). The error, then, was a Christian heresy in which Christ is viewed as one among many of the cosmic powers (11). Bornkamm pointed out that the phrase, στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (cf. 2,8.20), is well attested in "astral, theological, and demonological use in Persian-Chaldean, Oriental-Hellenistic mysteries, and Gnostic speculations" and that "the term was idiomatic and contained the slogan of the heresy" (12). To support his claim of Persian origin he argued that the various five-fold lists of attributes in Colossians (e.g. 3,5.8.12) betray acquaintance with the pentad schema of Iranian Gnosticism (13).

Recently several studies have appeared in which the traditional conclusion that the Colossian error was essentially Gnostic in character (whether Jewish, Pagan, or both) has been challenged (14). In several studies S. Lyonnet (15) has objected to the classification of

(8) DIBELIUS, "Isisweihe", 91-101.

(9) G. BORNKAMM, "Die Häresie des Kolosserbriefes", *TLZ* 73 (1948) 11-20, reprinted in BORNKAMM, *Das Ende des Gesetzes* (Munich 1952) 139-156, reprinted in FRANCIS and MEEKS, 123-145. Notes refer to second reprint.

(10) BORNKAMM, "Häresie", 124.

(11) BORNKAMM, "Häresie", 124-125.

(12) BORNKAMM, "Häresie", 125.

(13) BORNKAMM, "Häresie", 133-134.

(14) MUNCK, "The New Testament and Gnosticism", in W. KLASSEN and G. SNYDER (eds.), *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation* (New York 1962) 224-238 and C. COLPE, *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* (FRLANT 78; Göttingen 1961) have raised serious objections to the methods and conclusions of the comparative religions school which sees Gnosticism antedating Christianity. For a survey of the evidences see E. M. YAMAUCHI, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism* (Grand Rapids 1973).

(15) LYONNET, "L'étude du milieu littéraire et l'exégèse du Nouveau Testament: Les adversaires de Paul à Colosses", *Bib* 37 (1956) 27-38, reprinted in FRANCIS and MEEKS, 147-161 (notes refer to reprint); IDEM, "Col 2,18 et les Mystères d'Apollon Clarien", *Bib* 43 (1962) 417-435; IDEM, "Saint Paul et

such terms as πλήρωμα and σῶμα as Gnostic terminology when in fact they were well known in Stoic and other philosophical circles and were on that basis familiar to Paul⁽¹⁶⁾. As for the phrase, στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, Lyonnet argues that there is no compelling reason to understand it as a slogan for some Gnostic philosophy; he rather thinks that it may retain the same Jewish meaning as in Gal 4,3,9⁽¹⁷⁾. Lyonnet has found it difficult to believe that a Pagan cult, either outside the church (so Dibelius) or within it (so Bornkamm), could be in view when there is such meager evidence that any such cult existed⁽¹⁸⁾. Lyonnet concludes that the Colossian error was chiefly Jewish and ran along the lines of Qumranian mysticism and asceticism in which veneration of angels played an important part⁽¹⁹⁾.

F. O. Francis has argued that the Colossian error "may not have been christological in any important respect"⁽²⁰⁾, but was basically a question of *praxis*⁽²¹⁾. The errorists failed to understand their "completeness" in Christ (cf. Col 2,10) and so sought after their heavenly Lord through rigorous piety and mystical soul ascent⁽²²⁾. Francis finds no evidence of the presence of a Pagan cult (Gnostic or otherwise), but finds the presence of a tendency towards asceticism and mysticism in the broad context of Hellenism in general and in Judaism and Christianity in particular. In their zeal to be Christ-like the errorists have treated the flesh with severity and have participated in angelic liturgies⁽²³⁾.

le gnosticisme : la lettre aux Colossiens", in U. BIANCHI (ed.), *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden 1967) 538-561.

(16) LYONNET, "Paul's Adversaries", 147-148.

(17) LYONNET, "Paul's Adversaries", 148; IDEM, "Saint Paul et le gnosticisme", 538-551.

(18) LYONNET, "Paul's Adversaries", 150.

(19) LYONNET, "Paul's Adversaries", 151-153; IDEM, "Col 2,18 et les Mystères", 427-432.

(20) F. O. FRANCIS, "The Christological Argument of Colossians", in J. JERVELL (ed.), *God's Christ and His People* (Nils Dahl Festschrift; Oslo 1977) 193.

(21) FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship in Col 2:18", *ST* 16 (1962) 109-134, reprinted in FRANCIS and MEEKS, 163-195 (notes refer to reprint).

(22) FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 183-184.

(23) FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 184. W. CARR, "Two Notes on Colossians", *JTS* (1973) 492-500, comes to a similar conclusion.

A. J. Bandstra seconds the thesis of Francis, but after examining the same primary literature adds further clarification of the nature of the Colossian error⁽²⁴⁾. He finds in several Jewish apocalyptic and pseudepigraphal writings (the Qumran *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 4 *Ezra*, 2 *Apocalypse of Baruch*, and the *Apocalypse of Abraham*) the presence of polemic against the idea of a mediator of either redemption or creation⁽²⁵⁾. Bandstra believes that the Colossian errorists emphasized humility (cf. Col 2,18.23) as preparation for heavenly ascent in order to participate in angelic liturgies (cf. Col 2,18) without the assistance of a mediator⁽²⁶⁾. The errorists hope to discover and appropriate for themselves the "treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (cf. Col 2,3) which are hidden beneath God's throne⁽²⁷⁾. Consequently Paul attacks this teaching because it threatens Christ's role as mediator. As Lyonnet and Francis before him Bandstra finds nothing particularly Gnostic in the Colossian error.

II. Analysis of Contents

At this point an analysis of the contents of Colossians will serve the purpose of isolating the polemical passages. The assumption here is that the most prudent method for reconstructing the Colossian error is to extract its characteristics from direct statements and not to allow ourselves the unwarranted luxury of drawing inferences which lead to detailed systems from isolated vocabulary items and confessional statements in which there is no clear evidence of debate⁽²⁸⁾.

1,1-2. The greeting in Colossians is not unlike Paul's greetings in his other letters. In each of these greetings there is a remark which anticipates the main topic to be discussed in the balance of the epistle (e.g. Rom 1,1-7, where there is emphasis upon the "gospel" of the "Son of God"; 1 Cor 1,1-3, where there is mention of

(24) A. J. BANDSTRA, "Did the Colossian Errorists Need a Mediator?" in R. N. LONGENECKER and M. C. TENNEY (eds.), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids 1974) 329-343.

(25) BANDSTRA, "Errorists", 332-339.

(26) Particulary 1QH 6: 12f.

(27) BANDSTRA, "Errorists", 341.

(28) On this method, see FRANCIS, "The Christological Argument", 192-194.

"sanctity" and unity; Gal 1,1-5, where the emphasis is upon the divine calling of the apostle; Phil 1,1-2, where mention is made of church leaders). The apostle addresses the Colossians as "saints" (which is typical of Paul) and "faithful" (which is not typical of Paul). It will prove to be significant that the apostle refers to the Colossians as faithful.

1,3-8. The apostle's prayer of thanksgiving for the saints at Colossae is also quite similar to the prayers in his other epistles. Paul thanks God for their "faith", "hope", and "love". The fact of their belief and understanding of the gospel, as well as their growth and fruitfulness, is acknowledged by the apostle who has been informed by Epaphras of the situation at Colossae. This prayer, taken together with the greeting, gives every indication that the apostle regarded their faith as genuine and sound.

1,9-14. The apostle continues to describe the nature of his prayer for the Colossian saints. He desires that they be filled with the knowledge of God's will "in all the spiritual wisdom and understanding" in order "to lead a life worthy of the Lord, fully pleasing to him". Paul thanks God that the Colossian saints have been transferred into the kingdom of his beloved Son.

1,15-20. With the mention of the Son in v. 14 the apostle breaks off to recite a creedal hymn in honor of Christ⁽²⁹⁾. Not unlike the hymn in Phil 2,6-11 the Colossian hymn asserts the divinity of Christ and his headship over creation and the church.

1,21-23. The apostle reminds the Colossian saints of their former life of darkness in contrast to their present life of reconciliation. The saints are to be made "holy", "blameless", and "irreproachable", with the provision that they "continue in the faith, stable and steadfast".

1,24-29. In this section the apostle alludes to his personal experience as an apostle of Christ. He then provides a brief sketch of his understanding of the gospel and the apostolic ministry which has been entrusted to him.

2,1-7. In this section the apostle links his own ministry to the faith of the Colossians. He assures them that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are to be found in Christ and that no one

⁽²⁹⁾ For a critical reconstruction of the underlying hymn see J. M. ROBINSON, "A Formal Analysis of Colossians 1:15-20", *JBL* 76 (1957) 270-287 and N. KEHL, *Der Christushymnus im Kolosserbrief* (Stuttgart 1967).

should beguile them with persuasive speech. Even though he is physically absent, the apostle is present in spirit and so exhorts them to be "established in the faith, just as you were taught". It is at this point that we find the first mention of the errorists, although there is no mention of what their error is (v. 4).

2,8-15. This section is the first of three sections in which the Colossian error is directly addressed. The error is referred to as "philosophy" which is no more than "empty deceit" and which is "according to the elements of the world" and not "according to Christ". References are made to the thanksgiving prayer and the Christ hymn, references which have the effect of providing further expansion and application. The Colossians are to realize that in Christ they are made "complete".

2,16-19. This second polemical section provides a limited description of the practice of the Colossian errorists. Verse 18 is a decidedly difficult verse and will receive detailed attention in part three below. The apostle warns that because of their practice the errorists are not "holding fast to the head".

2,20-23. This section is the last passage which offers direct polemic against the Colossian error. The apostle cites certain regulations and asserts that although these may have the appearance of wisdom they are in effect human precepts and are of no value "in checking the indulgence of the flesh".

3,1-4. This section provides the transition from the preceding polemic to the exhortations which follow. Although the apostle no longer is speaking directly to the error itself, he no doubt has it in mind as he sets forth Christian principles in more positive terms. The Colossians are to set their minds upon the things above.

3,5-11 and 3,12-17. These two passages are similar to the "works of the flesh" and the "fruit of the Spirit" found in Galatians (cf. 5,19-23). In the first passage the apostle lists numerous evils and exhorts the Colossians to put them away. In the second section the apostle cites various virtues which the believers are to put on with the result of promoting fellowship and thanksgiving.

3,18 - 4,1. Here the apostle gives rules for the household, the so-called *Haustafeln*. Specific instructions are given to wives, husbands, children, fathers, slaves, and masters.

4,2-6 and 4,7-18. The apostle gives further exhortations and requests prayer in his behalf. The epistle closes with final instructions and greetings.

III. Exegesis

It would appear that the observation of Francis is sound. Those passages which are christological in focus (e.g. the hymn in 1,15-20) are non-polemical. The passages which are polemical and which clearly speak against the error are chiefly concerned with matters of *praxis*. Items of christology which appear in these polemical sections are not being debated but serve as the common ground to which appeal can be made. One possible exception would be the phrase, θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων ("worship of the angels", 2,18). Most interpreters agree that Col 2,18 holds the key for a reconstruction of the Colossian error. With this verse our exegesis will begin.

Virtually every word and phrase in Col 2,18 is subject to debate, but the problems are not to be attributed to textual uncertainties⁽³⁰⁾. The rare word, καταβραβεύειν, probably means "to deprive" or "to disqualify" in the sense of depriving one of a prize or deserved award⁽³¹⁾. Of what the Colossian saint is deprived must be determined from an examination of the larger context. To this question we shall return later. The participle θέλων, followed by the preposition ἐν, is notorious for its difficulty and has called forth numerous explanations⁽³²⁾. It is probably best explained as a Septuagintalism and corresponds to the Hebrew equivalent *hāpaš b'* and so means "taking pleasure in" or "having a desire for"⁽³³⁾. Whereas all agree that ταπεινοφροσύνη basically means "humility" there is disagreement whether the word here in 2,18 (and 2,23) means the same thing as when it is used later in 3,12⁽³⁴⁾. Francis has argued that the word is not negative, but is basically positive, as its appearance

⁽³⁰⁾ The only noteworthy variant is the insertion of a negative after the relative pronoun ἃ (e.g. \aleph^c C D^c K P Ψ and several minuscules read μὴ while G reads οὐκ). ἃ without the negative is read by P⁴⁶ \aleph^* A B D^{*}.

⁽³¹⁾ The simple form βραβεύειν means "to award". See FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 163-164; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 117.

⁽³²⁾ FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 164, lists the alternatives most often suggested.

⁽³³⁾ FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 164. LOHSE, *Colossians*, 118 cites the following examples: 1 Sam 18,22; 2 Sam 15,26; 1 Kgs 10,9; 1 Chr 28,4; Ps 111,1; 146,10; *Test. Asher* 1:6.

⁽³⁴⁾ FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 167.

in the list of virtues in 3,12 would suggest⁽³⁵⁾. Francis also points out the word's close association with fasting (Hebr. *ta'anîth*) as preparation for heavenly ascent, visions, revelations, etc.⁽³⁶⁾. E. Lohse doubts Francis' view and translates ταπεινοφροσύνη in 2,18.23 as "readiness to serve"⁽³⁷⁾. ταπεινοφροσύνη may not specifically imply fasting, but fasting would certainly be an aspect of humility. In any case, such an interpretation would require support from other points of exegesis.

Probably the most debated item in the verse is the phrase, θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων ("worship of the angels"). Most interpreters have taken the genitive as objective on the basis of two Patristic traditions in which it is declared that the Jews venerated angels and observed particular rites in their honor⁽³⁸⁾. Of course, if an incipient form of Gnosticism were in view, as Lightfoot had thought, then the ἄγγελοι could be understood as equivalents for the "elements of the world" and the "rulers and authorities" who would be the deities who rule the various spheres of heaven separating man from God. The Gnostics venerated these deities in their hope to gain the γνῶσις necessary for their ascent through heaven to the

(35) FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 168-171. In its other occurrences in the New Testament ταπεινοφροσύνη has positive meaning (cf. Acts 20,19; Eph 4,2; Phil 2,3; 1 Pet 5,5). LOHSE, *Colossians*, 118, criticizes FRANCIS ("Humility and Angelic Worship") and contends that the appearance of ταπεινοφροσύνη in 2,23 (ἐν ἐθελοθρησκίᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ: "in self-chosen worship and readiness to serve") shows that the word can be negative (i.e. in reference to the opponents' cultus) and should be taken so in 2,18. In an editorial addition FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 181-182, responds to this criticism by saying that Lohse has missed the point. The errorists have indeed "chosen" for themselves a style of humility and worship, but this in and of itself in no way suggests that ταπεινοφροσύνη must be understood as a negative reference to cultic practice (i.e. "readiness to serve"). Because of their attitude towards humility (which in itself is a virtue, cf. 3,12) and their emphasis upon experience, the errorists have a "self-chosen religion".

(36) FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 168-171; LOHSE, *Colossians*, 118. CARR, *Colossians*, 499, thinks that Francis is right, but the word should not, nevertheless, be limited to that meaning. In support of "fasting" are the dietary prohibitions (cf. 2,16.21).

(37) LOHSE, *Colossians*, 118, calls ταπεινοφροσύνη an explicit reference to "cultic conduct".

(38) FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 176-177, cites the *Preaching of Peter* and THEODORET.

place of light. However, it seems strange that the apostle would scorn such a belief only in passing, as it were, and not level a vigorous attack against such a serious christological heresy. In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul offers pointed rebuke to some of the Corinthian saints who have speculated, presumably along neo-Platonic lines, that there is no future resurrection from the dead. In all probability what was in view there was the idea that there would be no *physical* resurrection, but that the resurrection would only be spiritual. Paul concludes that if such a view was true then Christ was not raised and if Christ was not raised then there is no gospel. In Galatians 1, to cite another example, the apostle condemns the "gospel" of the Judaizers who wished to retain the essentials of the Mosaic faith (e.g. circumcision, the Sabbath, dietary laws). To be sure, these Judaizers believed in Christ, but because they have added something to the gospel of grace Paul adjures, "Let [them] be accursed!" (cf. Gal 1,8,9). It is hard to imagine why the apostle does not make in Colossians a more direct and impassioned attack against a view as serious, if not more so, as the ones in 1 Corinthians and Galatians. If Gnostics, then the errorists are actually advocating that Christ is but one deity among a host of others to all of whom worship and service are due. If, however, τῶν ἀγγέλων is taken as a subjective genitive, the dilemma is resolved⁽³⁹⁾. The Colossian errorists have not advocated the worship of the angels, they have advocated worshipping as the angels themselves worship God. Francis, Bandstra, N. Kehl, and G. Scholem have shown the important role that mystical participation in the heavenly liturgies played with Jewish mystics⁽⁴⁰⁾.

If θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων be taken as a subjective genitive then the relative clause, ὃ ἑώρακεν, is no longer a difficulty⁽⁴¹⁾, but fits into the picture harmoniously. The phrase, "what he has seen", re-

⁽³⁹⁾ FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 179-180; BANDSTRA, "Errorists", 331; CARR, *Colossians*, 500.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 176-182; KEHL, "Ernie-drigung und Erhöhung in Qumran und Kolossä", *ZKT* 91 (1969) 364-394; BANDSTRA, "Errorists", 331-332; G. SCHOLEM, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem 1941) 39-52; IDEM, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York 1960) 14-30.

⁽⁴¹⁾ LOHSE, *Colossians*, 119, n. 38, provides a discussion of the various theories advanced, most of which resort to textual emendations.

fers to "angelic worship" and not to some unknown mystery vision⁽⁴²⁾. The question *when* an individual sees this angelic worship is supplied by the participle ἐμβατεύων. Dibelius had argued on the basis of a comparison of several inscriptions found at the oracle of Apollo at Claros that ἐμβατεύειν was used as a technical term equivalent to μύειν⁽⁴³⁾. Therefore, in Col 2,18 it is a cipher for cultic initiation, that is to say, the participant *enters* the rites. Francis has argued convincingly, however, that in these inscriptions ἐμβατεύειν has no such technical meaning, but retains its basic meaning of entering⁽⁴⁴⁾. He cites examples of Jewish apocalyptic and pseudepigraphal literature in which the pious mystic enters heaven and beholds angelic liturgies⁽⁴⁵⁾. Therefore, the unexpressed, but understood, object of ἐμβατεύων in Col 2,18 is *heaven*. The result of this emphasis upon humility and subsequent heavenly ascent, according to the apostle, is arrogance. The apostle declares that all of this piety and visionary attainment lead to εἰκῇ φυσιοῦμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ ("vainly being puffed up by the mind of his flesh")⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Col 2,19 carries the thought further with another parallel participial phrase, καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν ("and not holding fast to the head [i.e. Christ]"). If the Colossian error is thought to be

(42) DIBELIUS, "Isisweihe", 87, originally thought that the relative pronoun was the direct object of the participle ἐμβατεύων, i.e. the initiate "entered what he had seen". According to Dibelius this meant the actual process of initiation. In his later commentary he altered his interpretation concluding that "what he had seen" referred to a vision of the "cosmic elements". LOHSE, *Colossians*, 120-121, follows this interpretation. CARR, *Colossians*, 499, suggests correctly that α. ἐόρακεν is parenthetical.

(43) DIBELIUS, "Isisweihe", 86-87.

(44) FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 171-176.

(45) FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 173-175; IDEM, "The Background of EMBATEYEIN (Col 2:18) in Legal Papyri and Oracle Inscriptions", FRANCIS and MEEKS, 197-207. FRANCIS cites examples in the LXX (e.g. Josh 19,49.51; 22,24-26) where Israel is to "enter" (ἐμβατεύειν) its promised inheritance. He also notes that the church father Nemesius of Emesa (*De Nat. Hom.*, Matt. pp. 63-65) states that man enters (ἐμβατεύειν) heaven by contemplation. In private communication Francis reported that N. Dahl has found ἐμβατεύειν in the Greek fragments of Cicero in the context of "entering heaven".

(46) Elsewhere Paul describes the arrogant as having minds that are "puffed up" (e.g. 1 Cor 5,2; 8,1; 2 Cor 12,20) and set on the "flesh" (e.g. Rom 8,7). LOHSE, *Colossians*, 121.

Gnostic then the usual approach to this phrase is to understand it as severance from Christ's headship in the sense that if one worships other deities then one has severed oneself from Christ⁽⁴⁷⁾. Bandstra's view would imply that the errorists have severed their relationship with Christ because they mistakenly believe that they can gain access to the heavenly realm apart from Christ's work as mediator⁽⁴⁸⁾. Bandstra has described, as mentioned above, what he calls a "polemic against a divine mediator of creation and/or redemption"⁽⁴⁹⁾. Whereas it is true that the primary texts in question suggest that the mystic is able to gain access to heaven without the aid of a mediator and so may directly participate in heavenly worship with the angels, there is no clear evidence that these writings contain *polemic* against mediation⁽⁵⁰⁾, much less is there evidence that such a polemic is present in the Colossian error. Such a polemic would be tantamount to a rejection of Christ himself, which is inconceivable in the context of the church and even more inconceivable in that Paul does not offer severe and direct condemnation. Bandstra is quite correct in his observation, like that of Francis before him, that the goal of the errorists is heavenly ascent and participation in angelic worship, but in what sense are they "not holding fast to the head"⁽⁵¹⁾? As the metaphor suggests, the phrase contains an ecclesiological implication. The errorists are not functioning properly in the church, the body of Christ, of which all believers are members and over whom Christ is the "head"; οὐ κρατῶν does not necessarily carry the connotation of "severance", but may also suggest disruption in the proper relationship or a failure to submit to authority⁽⁵²⁾. By advocating that true worship and service are to be had

(47) So LOHSE, *Colossians*, 121.

(48) BANDSTRA, "Errorists", 332-343.

(49) BANDSTRA, "Errorists", 332.

(50) At the very most it could be suggested that these traditions wish to emphasize God's role as Creator and Redeemer, perhaps at the expense of angel-venerating traditions.

(51) In his earlier work "Humility and Angelic Worship" FRANCIS does not interpret this phrase, nor does Bandstra. CARR, *Colossians*, 500, only alludes to it. In his later article "The Christological Argument", 202, FRANCIS concludes that the phrase means "being at variance with the church" and he further states that (p. 204) "this deviance calls into question [the errorists'] faithfulness to church authority and tradition".

(52) One is reminded of Paul's discussion in Rom 8,5 where the contrast is made between placing one's mind either on the Spirit or on the flesh and

only in heaven the errorists are neglecting and, indeed, perhaps despising, the function of the body on the earth. Thus, the apostle declares that the errorists are “not holding fast to the head” which nourishes the body and so brings it to maturity.

Col 2,18-19a may now be translated, with interpretive additions within brackets, as follows: “Let no one disqualify you [of the prize which is rightfully yours in Christ] having a desire for humility and the worship of angels (which he has seen upon entering [heaven]) being vainly puffed up by the mind of his flesh, and not holding fast to the head [as they themselves suppose]”.

More needs to be said regarding the phrase, οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι (“the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden”, Col 2,3). Bandstra has noted an important parallel in 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 54:13. The text reads as follows:

For with Thy counsel Thou dost govern all the creatures
which Thy right hand has created,
And Thou hast established every fountain of light beside
Thee,
And the treasures of wisdom beneath Thy throne hast Thou
prepared ⁽⁵³⁾.

Bandstra also notes another important parallel in 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 44:14: “These are they who have acquired for themselves treasures [Latin reads *promptuaria*] of wisdom, and with them are found stores [Latin reads *thesauri*] of understanding” ⁽⁵⁴⁾. Bandstra has pointed out that in 2 *Apocalypse of Baruch*, as well as the other similar writings mentioned above, there are numerous references to heavenly ascent and entrance ⁽⁵⁵⁾. If our exegesis of Col 2,18-19a is correct then the appearance of this parallel phrase in Col 2,3 makes perfect sense. The

Rom 8,7, “for the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God’s law...”. To be sure, the contrast here is between believer and unbeliever, but a parallel principle may very well be present in Col 2,19, namely, failure to submit oneself to the church by indulging in independent activities is not submitting to the head of the church.

⁽⁵³⁾ BANDSTRA, “Errorists”, 341. Bandstra notes (p. 341, n. 73) that the Syriac equivalent of “the treasures of wisdom” is rendered in the Latin version by *thesauros sapientiae*.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ BANDSTRA, “Errorists”, 342.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ BANDSTRA, “Errorists”, 337.

Colossian errorists wish to enter heaven, participate in the worship of the angels, and discover and acquire the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which are hidden in God's throne room. It is on the basis of this experience and this newly acquired wisdom that the errorists feel that they are in a position to judge their fellow brethren and so deprive them of their sense of completion in Christ. The errorists have experienced the quintessence of spirituality and so make demands upon those who have not. For this reason they have become arrogant (εἰκῇ φυστούμενος) and have unwittingly disrupted the function of the body itself (οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν).

But there is one other phrase that many interpreters have found significant for the interpretation of the Colossian error. In Col 2,8.20 the phrase, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, occurs. In v. 8 "according to the elements of the world" stands in direct contrast and opposition to "according to Christ". In v. 20 the Colossians are told that they "have died with Christ from the elements of the world". Bornkamm concluded that this phrase referred to the ἀρχαί and the ἐξουσίαι of 2,15, as well as the ἄγγελοι of 2,18, and so should be understood as a reference to spiritual beings⁽⁵⁶⁾. Therefore, the Colossians should realize that it is wrong to worship divine beings which in reality are in opposition to Christ their Lord. This interpretation, of course, is based upon taking the phrase, "worship of angels", in the objective sense and assuming that the Colossian error had something to do with Gnosticism or a Pagan cult. Lohse interprets the phrase similarly⁽⁵⁷⁾. It is true that there is evidence, largely supported by Gal 4,3-9, that the "elements of the world" are beings who exercise certain control over men⁽⁵⁸⁾. In response men

⁽⁵⁶⁾ BORNKAMM, "Häresie", 123-124. The RSV translates "elemental spirits". It is questionable to equate all of these references. Whereas both the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου and the ἀρχαί and ἐξουσίαι are cast in a negative light it is not at all certain that the author understood them as one and the same. Furthermore, according to our interpretation of 2,18 ἄγγελοι are not viewed negatively.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ LOHSE, *Colossians*, 99. So also E. SCHWEIZER, "Christ in the Letter to the Colossians", *RevExp* 70 (1973) 451-467, see p. 452.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ LOHSE, *Colossians*, 96-99, provides an excursus on the topic. SCHWEIZER (pp. 453-454) thinks that the "elements" are not spirits or gods, but as in many Greek texts, the parts of the universe, i.e. earth, water, air, and fire. Such use of στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου appears in the LXX (e.g. 4 Macc 12,13) and the Patristic literature as well (e.g. *Diogn.* 7:2; 8:2; *Herm. Vis.* 3:13:3). But in view of the meaning of the phrase in Galatians 4

sought to understand them and to penetrate their secrets in order to appease them. And, this is precisely what the Colossian errorists were attempting to do. They wished to discover all of the secrets of the heavenly places in order to know how to worship God more fully. Paul contemptuously calls this a human tradition (κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 2,8) "according to the elements of the world" and not "according to Christ" (⁵⁹). In Gal 4,3-9 the Jewish condition prior to the coming of God's Son was inferior, according to Paul, and is also called religion "according to the elements of the world" (⁶⁰). By seeking heavenly places, searching for divine wisdom, and hoping to partake of the divine fulness (πλήρωμα), the apostle likens the practice as according to the elements of the world, the condition with which man was faced prior to the saving event of Christ. In effect, it is a step backwards. Paul assures the Colossians that "because in him all the fulness of deity dwells" (1,19; 2,9) they "are made complete in him" (2,10). There is therefore no need to observe ascetic taboos (2,16.20-23) and to pursue mystical experiences (2,18). If one is found in Christ, one is complete.

The errorists believed that the earth-bound church is but the σκιά ("shadow" or "copy"; 2,17) of the σῶμα (literally "body", but in neo-Platonism it means "reality") in heaven (⁶¹). Therefore, they urge fellow saints to move beyond the pattern, the shadow, and move up to the substance, the real. This shift, as we have found, is accomplished by rigorous piety which is to result in heavenly experiences. In what is probably intended to be ironic, Paul answers this doctrine by asserting that such ascetic practices are in fact themselves "only a shadow [σκιά] of what is to come", but the real is the "body [σῶμα] of Christ" (2,16-17). The irony is that the reality or substance is the body of Christ, the church, which is on earth and not in heaven. Heavenly experiences are but mere patterns or

B. REICKE, "The Law and the World according to Paul", *JBL* 70 (1951) 261-263, thinks that the "elements" must have personal characteristics.

(⁵⁹) Paul also refers to the error as ἡ φιλοσοφία ("the philosophy", 2,8), but the word was so widely used and had such general application in the first century that it often meant no more than "opinion", "point of view", or "speculation". It is misleading to think that "the philosophy" in Col 2,8 must refer to a fully developed system of philosophy or religion. See LOHSE, *Colossians*, 94-95.

(⁶⁰) See LYONNET, "Paul's Adversaries", 148-149.

(⁶¹) FRANCIS, "Humility and Angelic Worship", 182-183.

images of what is to come when Christ appears (cf. 3,4). Once again, what is in view here is ecclesiological, not christological. In pursuing what they suppose to be heavenly reality the errorists in fact are unwittingly promoting practices which obstruct the function of the church.

Col 3,1-4 adds further irony in that the apostle, who has already emphasized the completeness that the believer has in Christ and that he need not seek heavenly experiences, nevertheless exhorts the believer to "seek the things that are above, where Christ is... [and to] set [his] mind on the things that are above" (3,1-2). The treasures of wisdom and knowledge (2,3) may be hidden in Christ, but so is the believer hidden with Christ in God (3,3). Thus, Paul is in effect asserting that all that the errorists seek is in reality already possessed by the believer. By virtue of being found in Christ the believer shares in the fulness of God, has access to the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and is free from ascetic requirements and mystical experiences which in reality are of no spiritual benefit (cf. They have "no value in checking the indulgence of the flesh", 2,23b).

Conclusion

In this study it has been suggested that the Colossian error was not a Gnostic heresy nor a Pagan mystery cult, either of which carries serious christological implications⁽⁶²⁾. Rather, the error has

⁽⁶²⁾ FRANCIS, "The Christological Argument", 204, concludes: "The irreducible fact is, however, that the writer never explicitly identifies for attack any specific christological position of the opponents". If a christological error is not the substance of the debate then it becomes highly doubtful that the Colossian error was a form of incipient Gnosticism and/or a Pagan cult. YAMAUCHI, *Gnosticism*, 45, lists the following elements as having been largely responsible for convincing many scholars that the Colossian error was a Gnostic heresy: (1) the warning against "the philosophy" (Col 2,8); (2) emphasis upon πλήρωμα (Col 1,19; 2,9); and (3) the church described as the σῶμα of Christ (Col 1,18.24) which supposedly reflects Gnostic cosmic christology. Regarding the first point, the term φιλοσοφία is much too broad to be limited to a specific group or theology (see n. 59 above). As for πλήρωμα and σῶμα Lyonnet and others have shown that these words were in common circulation among Stoics and other groups and were a part of the intellectual vocabulary of the first century. Although it is true that πλήρωμα and σῶμα (as well as γνῶσις, σοφία, νοῦς, λόγος, and a host of other terms) came to

been described against the background of Jewish mysticism, the sort of mysticism found at Qumran⁽⁶³⁾, in apocalyptic and pseudepigraphal writings, and in later Rabbinic traditions. It should be pointed out that the idea of an ascent into heaven is not unheard of in the New Testament: Paul himself claims the experience (cf. 2 Cor 12,1-4), the seer of the Apocalypse is caught up into heaven (cf. Rev 4,1-2), and several heavenly visions are reported in Acts (e.g. 7,55-56; 9,3-7; 10,3-7; 18,9-10). Indeed, it is possible that the Colossian errorists themselves appealed to Paul to arbitrate in the dispute in the hope that the apostle would commend them for their great spiritual attainments. The problem at Colossae is in some ways similar to that of the Corinthian church. It has been suggested that the apostle faced a type of "divine man" christology at Corinth in which great emphasis was placed upon supernatural gifts and ecstatic activities⁽⁶⁴⁾. Paul found gifts misused at Corinth and the church in a general state of division and disorder. At Colossae the implication of what Christ meant was in danger of being distorted and overlooked. After citing the Christ hymn (1,15-20), taken by the Colossians as common ground, the apostle reminded the Colossians that "as therefore you received Christ Jesus the Lord, so live in him . . . just as you were taught" (2,6-7). The errorists' emphasis upon ascetic practices and personal experiences ran counter to the apostolic gospel of fulness and liberty⁽⁶⁵⁾. Ascetic-mysticism was not the way they received Christ, the way they taught. Such practices, and the resultant elitism, robbed the brethren of the sense of fulness which was rightfully theirs by virtue of being in Christ. They were to be reminded that because Christ is the head of all rule

have significant meaning in Gnostic literature, it is not at all certain that these terms, when employed in Colossians, have Gnosticism in view.

(⁶³) See L. M. CONGDON, "The False Teachers at Colossae: Affinities with Essene and Philonic Thought", *The Drew Gateway* 40 (1970) 162-163.

(⁶⁴) Many scholars think that not only were Paul's opponents in Corinth enthusiasts who advocated divine man christology, but that the evangelist Mark wrote his gospel emphasizing the cross and suffering in order to combat a similar movement. See the discussion of such a phenomenon in J. M. ROBINSON, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (with H. KOESTER, Philadelphia 1971) 30-46. On the topic of enthusiasm in the early church see J. D. G. DUNN, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (Philadelphia 1977) 176-184.

(⁶⁵) E. LOHSE, "Pauline Theology in the Letter to the Colossians", *NTS* 15 (1968) 211-220, see esp. 213.

and authority and possesses all the fulness of deity, every believer is made complete and need not seek to augment his standing before the heavenly court or before one another.

Dept. of Religious Studies
Trinity Western College
7600 Glover Road
Langley B.C. Canada V3A 4R9

Craig A. EVANS

SOMMAIRE

Quelle était l'erreur des Colossiens? On a souvent supposé que l'auteur de Colossiens avait affaire à quelque hérésie gnostique ou qu'il était lui-même gnostique. Les travaux récents de F. O. Francis et A. J. Bandstra ont suggéré qu'il s'agissait plutôt d'une forme de piété mystique, dans la mouvance du mysticisme chrétien et juif du premier siècle. En effet, les parties polémiques des Colossiens traitent de la piété mystique et non de la christologie *per se*. L'exégèse de ces passages amène à cette conclusion: les Colossiens affirmaient que le chrétien ne peut découvrir la plénitude du Christ que par ces expériences mystiques; l'auteur de Colossiens prétend, au contraire, que le croyant possède déjà la plénitude du Christ et ne doit pas se soumettre aux rigueurs de cette piété exigeante.

Prophetic Delegation: A Form-Critical Inquiry

When Yhwh called Moses to be his prophet, one of Moses' objections was that he could not speak well. Yhwh responded that Aaron should speak for Moses: "He shall speak for you to the people; and he shall be a mouth for you, and you shall be to him as God" (Exod 4,16)(¹). Are there other examples of a relationship in which a prophet acts "as God" to another prophet? This paper is an attempt to investigate uses of OT prophetic literary forms which transcend their original purpose. We wish to demonstrate a type of formal delegation of the prophetic role in which someone constitutes another a spokesman of God as God does the prophet. Our method will be to point to instances in which two literary types — the messenger formula and the symbolic act account — are used by a prophet to delegate another person for a prophetic role.

I. The Messenger Formula(²)

The messenger formula is common in the OT. Two forms are *kōh 'āmar yhwh* ("thus says Yhwh") and *nē'um yhwh* ("oracle of Yhwh"); less frequently a third form is used: *'āmar yhwh* ("says Yhwh"). The pre-prophetic *Sitz im Leben* may have been the self-presentation of a messenger identifying the source of the message(³), or perhaps the cultic delivery of a divine oracle(⁴). In either case the formula names the source of the message(⁵).

(¹) See also Exod 7,1; 16,9. All biblical quotations are taken from the RSV.

(²) C. WESTERMANN, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (London 1967) 100-115.

(³) WESTERMANN, *Basic Forms*, 100. Secular examples of the messenger formula can be seen in Gen 32,4-5; 1 Kgs 22,27; Ezra 1,2.

(⁴) G. FOHRER, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York 1968) 352-353.

(⁵) WESTERMANN, *Basic Forms*, 114.

Westermann notes that many times the messenger formula is part of an act of commissioning which consists of

- a) an instruction to the messenger;
- b) messenger formula;
- c) messenger's speech.

Many times the third element is not reported though it is understood to have been accomplished⁽⁶⁾.

The prophets' use of the messenger formula is an establishment of their claim of authority. They are spreading the word of Yhwh; their message has a divine source. Oftentimes that message is characterized by the use of the divine "I" within the message itself. There are some examples, however, where a prophet commissions another person to deliver the divine message; to do so using the messenger formula; and even to employ the divine "I".

Jer 21,1-14. In Jer 21,1-14 King Zedekiah has sent two messengers to Jeremiah inquiring about the future of the war being waged by Nebuchadrezzar. The ensuing message is identified as the word of Yhwh (v. 1). Jeremiah three times delegates the two messengers to take back a divine message, i.e. a message to Zedekiah (v. 4), one to the people (v. 8), and another to the royal house (v. 11). In each instance he commands the use of the messenger formula (vv. 4.8.12). In all three cases the message includes the use of the divine "I" (vv. 4-7; 8-10; 12-14). The text implies that Yhwh authorized Jeremiah to act through the king's messengers (v. 1).

Jer 27,1-11. The text is more explicit about Yhwh's command to delegate the prophetic role in Jer 27,1-11. It is a complex passage which deals with three messages embedded in one another, each of which begins at a different point. Beginning in v. 2 Yhwh commands Jeremiah to perform a series of actions, which includes sending a message to the kings of the neighboring countries by means of

⁽⁶⁾ WESTERMANN, *Basic Forms*, 101. The act of commissioning is related to, but different than the prophetic call narrative (see, for example, N. HABEL, "Form and Significance of the Prophetic Call Narrative", *ZAW* 77 [1965] 297-323) or an installation *Gattung* (cf. D. MCCARTHY, "An Installation Genre?", *JBL* 90 [1971] 31-41). In the prophetic call narrative one is principally commissioned as a prophet, while the installation genre has nothing essentially to do with prophecy. Furthermore, the message formula is central to Westermann's act of commissioning, but the formula has no role in the call narrative or the installation genre.

their envoys. The speech of commissioning which Jeremiah is commanded to use begins in v. 4b. The message that the envoys are to deliver to their respective kings does not begin until v. 5.

Jeremiah is commanded to use the messenger formula when commissioning the envoys with the divine message (v. 4b). This will authenticate Jeremiah's command to them, but, as the text stands, this messenger formula is not explicitly included in the message the envoy must deliver (vv. 5-11). Because we do not see the actual delegation of the envoys, which would be the fulfillment of Jeremiah's own commission from Yhwh, we do not know if *he* tells them to use the messenger formula. But note that the divine "I" does occur eight times in the message to be delivered to the kings (vv. 5.6.8.10.11). We may conjecture that the messenger formula was a part of the message, and was employed by the envoys; cf. *nē'um yhwh* in Jeremiah's parallel message to his own king (v. 15). Although there is no report of accomplishment in either stage of commissioning, we infer their fulfillment from the fact that "in like manner" Jeremiah also spoke to his own king (v. 12).

1 Kgs 14,1-18. The case is similar in *1 Kgs 14,1-18*. The son of Jeroboam is ill and Jeroboam sends his wife to the prophet Ahijah to find out what will happen to the child (vv. 1-3). Yhwh tells Ahijah that she is coming and says to him, "Thus and thus you shall say to her" (v. 5). When she arrives Ahijah gives her a message. She is to return to Jeroboam and tell him, "Thus says Yhwh, the God of Israel:" and the message follows, using the divine "I" (v. 7).

Again we have an explicit command from Yhwh to delegate the divine message (v. 5). We even have a command to delegate the use of the messenger formula: in v. 7 Ahijah explicitly commands the wife of Jeroboam to use it. There is no reason or indication to suppose that she did not fulfill her delegation(?).

2 Kgs 22,15-20. In *2 Kgs 22,15-20* a "committee" has been sent by King Josiah to consult with Huldah the prophetess concerning the veracity of the book of the law found in the temple. She sends the representatives back with two messages for the king, one concerning the people (vv. 15-17), and another concerning Josiah himself (vv. 18-20).

(?) Another much less clear example in Jeremiah of Yhwh commanding the delegation of a prophet may be *Jer 37,3-10*.

Huldah identifies her message as the word of Yhwh commissioning her to delegate the king's messengers. In both cases they are instructed to carry a message (vv. 15b.18a) and to use the messenger formula and the divine "I" when delivering the messages (vv. 16a.18b). The report of execution is simple enough: "And they brought back word to the king" (v. 20).

There are other instances in which, as the text now stands, the delegations of the role seems to be solely the choice of the prophet. It will be useful to recall the free hand with which a prophet might exercise his or her vocation⁽⁸⁾. Yhwh called and directed a prophet, but the prophet remained free to choose the means and words to communicate the divine message.

2 Kgs 9,1-10. Another example of prophetic freedom in the delegation of the prophetic role is evident in 2 Kgs 9,1-10. Elisha calls an unnamed prophet and instructs him to prepare for a journey to Ramoth-Gilead. Once there he is to locate Jehu, take him into an inner chamber, anoint him king, and then flee (vv. 1-3). Elisha instructs the anonymous prophet to use the messenger formula and the divine "I" when he anoints Jehu: "and say 'Thus says Yhwh, I anoint you king over Israel'" (v. 3). Vv. 4-10 give a full report of the accomplishment of this prophetic delegation, including the actual use of the messenger formula (v. 6) by the unnamed prophet. This pericope appears to follow Westermann's outline of an act of commissioning: the instruction (vv. 1b-3), the commission to use the messenger formula (v. 6), and a report of the messenger's speech (vv. 7-10)⁽⁹⁾. In this case there is no immediate command from

⁽⁸⁾ For an extended treatment of prophetic freedom, see G. VON RAD, *Old Testament Theology* (Edinburgh 1962) II, 70-79. In addition to the examples cited by von Rad, an instance of prophetic freedom is 1 Kgs 19,16. Yhwh commands Elijah to anoint (*mšh*) Elisha. 1 Kgs 19,19 tells us that Elijah threw his mantle over Elisha, and there is no suggestion either that this action was inadequate or that an anointing was performed at a later time. While not an example of the *Gattung* we are discussing, this passage demonstrates that prophetic freedom even extended to the manner of commissioning another prophet.

⁽⁹⁾ J. ELLUL, *The Politics of God and the Politics of Man* (ed. G. W. Bromiley) (Grand Rapids 1972) 98, suggests that the prophet exceeded Elisha's command by adding his own words, and that there was no suggestion of such a message in Elisha's original delegation. However, there are other examples of such an extension of a commission, e.g. Ezek 24,15-27.

Yhwh to Elisha; in fact, the command to anoint Jehu had been given, not to Elisha, but to Elijah (1 Kgs 19,16). There is thus an implicit delegation from Elijah to Elisha, and an explicit sub-delegation to the unnamed prophet, and this anointing is understood to be the fulfillment of the earlier command from Yhwh.

Jer 36,1-8. Another example of delegation is to be found in *Jer 36,1-8*. This key chapter narrates the events which follow Jeremiah's dictation of a scroll to his scribe Baruch. Baruch first reads the scroll in the temple, and then in private for the advisors of the king. The advisors in turn read it to King Jehoiakim, who proceeds to burn the scroll piece by piece. The chapter ends with Jeremiah dictating a new scroll, similar to the first although longer.

In vv. 1-2 Yhwh commands Jeremiah to prepare the scroll. Jeremiah fulfills the command by dictating the words of Yhwh to Baruch (v. 4). Later Jeremiah appears to extend that commission by ordering Baruch to read the scroll in the temple (v. 6), because Jeremiah himself had been barred from appearing there. This second distinct action seems to be an exercise of prophetic freedom as Jeremiah chooses the means to carry out the divine commission.

These verses appear to be a narrative of a prophet delegating his role to another. While the messenger formula is not explicit, there are reasons to assume that it was used. We have been told that the scroll contained the words of Yhwh (v. 4), that Baruch was commanded to read the words of Yhwh (v. 6), and that he did in fact read the words of Yhwh (v. 8; cf. vv. 10,15). It seems likely that the proclamation of the scroll would begin with the words "Thus says Yhwh". If, as some scholars speculate, *Jer 2,1-2* is the beginning of the scroll mentioned in *ch. 36* ⁽¹⁰⁾, then the messenger formula clearly is part of what Baruch read.

Along with the implicit messenger formula, the instructions to the delegate (vv. 5-6) and the report of the fulfillment (v. 8) of the task given to Baruch are at least an ordinary act of commissioning and despite the absence of explicit delegation to use the messenger formula, seems likely to be a prophetic commissioning as well. Support for this inference is found in the clear parallels between Yhwh's

⁽¹⁰⁾ W. SCHOTTROFF, "Jeremiah 2,1-3", *ZTK* 67 (1970) 263-294, refers to this opinion and attributes it to R. Bach, W. Rudolph, and A. Weiser, among others (pp. 284-285).

words to Jeremiah in v. 3 and Jeremiah's words in v. 7. In each case the words detail the motivation for the preceding command: the first to write the scroll, and the second to read it publicly.

Jer 36,3

A — Perhaps the house of Judah

will hear all the evil

B — Which I intend to do to them

C — So that each will turn

from his evil way

D — And I will forgive their

iniquity and their sin.

Jer 36,7

A' — Perhaps their prayer will
fall before Yhwh

C' — And each will turn

from his evil way

D' — For great is the

anger and the wrath

B' — Which Yhwh spoke against
his people.

We can see that A and A' are both acts of listening; B and B' describe Yhwh's plans; C and C' are virtually the same; D and D' are the divine responses (forgiveness vs. anger). The prophet models his delegation of Baruch on the form and even the words of his own commission from Yhwh⁽¹¹⁾. We can theorize that Jeremiah's delegation of Baruch arises out of Jeremiah's understanding of his own commission from Yhwh, and that he uses his prophetic freedom to determine the means to fulfill it.

To summarize thus far: we have examined several passages in which it appears that a prophet has delegated to another a prophetic role, including the use of the messenger formula and the divine "I". That is, a prophet has told another person to deliver a message in the name of Yhwh. These texts reflect the fact and the details of the delegation in a variety of ways.

In Jer 27,1-11 and 1 Kgs 14,1-18 a command from Yhwh to delegate is explicit. However, the former does not contain an explicit command from the prophet to delegate use of the messenger formula while the latter does. We can infer the use of the messenger formula

⁽¹¹⁾ M. KESSLER, "Form-Critical Suggestions on Jeremiah 36", *CBQ* 28 (1966) 389-401, notes that the "obedience formula" of this verse is similar to what is normally used for human compliance with divine commands: "N. did everything which N. commanded him" (p. 393). This would support our idea of the prophet acting in the role of God when delegating the prophetic role. Some examples of Kessler's "obedience formula" are Exod 40,16; Lev 8,4; 1 Kgs 17,5. An example of its secular use is in 2 Kgs 16,16.

in the first instance from the use of the divine "I" in the message which the envoys are to deliver.

In two other passages, Jer 21,1-14 and 2 Kgs 22,15-20, Yhwh's command to the prophet to delegate his message is only implicit. But in delegating that message to the intermediaries, the prophet in each case explicitly commands the use of the messenger formula and the divine "I" in the message.

In the two remaining passages, the prophet's delegation of his message seems to be an exercise of prophetic freedom in choosing the means to carry out his commission. Yet the delegation is clear in both cases, and the use of the messenger formula is explicitly commanded in 2 Kgs 9,1-10. In Jer 36,1-8, we can only infer such a command.

II. The Symbolic Act Account⁽¹²⁾

A *Gattung* employed in the prophetic books is the symbolic act account. According to Fohrer there are three essential elements to the genre:

- a) command to perform the action;
- b) account of the action itself;
- c) interpretation of the action.

However, in many instances the report (b) is missing because the performance of the symbolic act is taken for granted⁽¹³⁾.

Symbolic acts are related to magic — it is there we find the roots of symbolic action. But the two are different, because symbolic actions are effective proclamations of the word of Yhwh, and share in that power⁽¹⁴⁾. They propose to bring about what they signify, not in an

⁽¹²⁾ G. FOHRER, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York 1968) 356. The standard treatment is FOHRER, "Die Gattung der Berichte über symbolische Handlungen der Propheten", *ZAW* 64 (1952) 101-120 (= *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie* (1949-1965) *BZAW* 99 [Berlin 1967] 92-112); and *Die symbolischen Handlungen der Propheten* (Zurich 1953). Also J. H. HAYES, (ed.) *Old Testament Form Criticism* (San Antonio 1974) 172.

⁽¹³⁾ FOHRER, *Introduction*, 356. See, for example, Jer 19; 43,8-13; Ezek 4; 24,1-14.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. G. FOHRER, *History of Israelite Religion* (New York 1972) 241; J. LINDBLOM, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1962) 171-173; E. JACOB,

automatic (magical) way, but dependent on the will of Yhwh to accomplish the event signified⁽¹⁵⁾.

Jer 51,59-64a. Several authors have pointed to the symbolic act found in *Jer 51,59-64a*, though in some cases it is not clear if they acknowledge the use of the *Gattung*⁽¹⁶⁾. In the passage we are told that Jeremiah writes all his oracles about the destruction of Babylon in a book. He commands Seraiah, the brother of Baruch and the quartermaster of King Zedekiah, to take the book with him to Babylon. There he is to read it aloud. When he has finished he is to tie a stone to the scroll and throw it into the Euphrates saying, "Thus shall Babylon sink, to rise no more, because of the evil I am bringing upon her".

The command to execute the act comprises most of the passage (vv. 59-63) and the meaning of the act is found in the words to accompany the sinking of the scroll (v. 64). We do not have a report of the accomplished act, but we have seen that this is not unusual. This passage contains the elements of the symbolic act *Gattung*, but it is Jeremiah who commands the symbolic action to be performed.

Hos 3,1-5. Recent commentaries also classify *Hos 3* as a symbolic act account⁽¹⁷⁾. They identify the elements of the *Gattung* as follows:

Theology of the Old Testament (New York 1958) 243-244; H. L. ELLISON, "The Prophecy of Jeremiah: Jeremiah's Symbolism", *EvQ* 40 (1968) 36; M. P. MATTHENEY, Jr., cites further literature in "Interpretation of Hebrew Prophetic Symbolic Act", *Encounter* 29 (1968) 263-267.

⁽¹⁵⁾ M. KESSLER, "Form-Critical Suggestions", 389-401; "The Significance of *Jer 36*", *ZAW* 81 (1969) 381-383, has suggested that *Jer 36* is a symbolic act account. His definition of symbolic act as that which is "performed to enhance the word spoken by the prophet" differs from the standard treatment by Fohrer, as Kessler admits. Further, it is not clear whether Kessler identifies Jeremiah's writing of the scroll or Baruch's reading of the scroll as the symbolic act. In either case, the actions do not have the elements of the *Gattung* with which we are now dealing, and Kessler's suggestion does not prove helpful to us here.

⁽¹⁶⁾ FOHRER, *History*, 240; W. L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah: Spokesman Out of Time* (Philadelphia 1974) 125; J. BRIGHT, *Jeremiah* (AB 21; Garden City, N.Y. 1965) 212; cf. E. A. LESLIE, *Jeremiah* (New York 1954) 216.

⁽¹⁷⁾ There is a vast amount of material on *Hosea 3*. Recent commentaries include D. N. FREEDMAN and F. I. ANDERSEN, *Hosea* (AB 24; Garden City, N.Y. 1980); J. L. MAYS, *Hosea* (Philadelphia 1969) 54-60; G. DEL OLMO LETE, *La vocación del líder en el Antiguo Israel* (Salamanca 1973) 222-223;

- a) command to perform the symbolic action — v. 1;
- b) account of the act itself — vv. 2-3;
- c) interpretation of the action — vv. 4-5⁽¹⁸⁾.

Even so, the authors recognize that the symbolic act account cannot be precisely delineated as above. "Within this basic structure there is a movement, a progressive unfolding in which the meaning of the symbolic act grows"⁽¹⁹⁾. The command of Yhwh in v. 1 takes on new dimension and significance when Hosea carries it out in the manner described in this chapter. The reader only becomes aware of this transition gradually, paced by the dramatic poetry of the five verses.

The difficulty with the commentators' proposed outline of the chapter is that the interpretation given in vv. 4-5 does not correspond to the act commanded in v. 1 and performed in v. 2. A complex, but more accurate, outline of the chapter, would be:

- a) command to perform the symbolic act — v. 1a;
- b) interpretation of the symbolic act — v. 1b⁽²⁰⁾;
- c) account of the act itself — vv. 2-5;
 - i) the action — v. 2;
 - ii) the command — v. 3;
 - iii) the interpretation of the command — vv. 4-5a⁽²¹⁾.

In this outline, each case of command and interpretation is parallel in both structure and content:

J. M. WARD, *Hosea: A Theological Commentary* (New York 1966) 47-71; H. W. WOLFF, *Hosea* (Philadelphia 1974) 56-64. Much of the material in this section is similar to the work of these authors, but they do not deal specifically with the delegation of the prophetic role according to the symbolic act *Gattung*. For reference to other standard commentaries on this chapter, cf. H. W. ROWLEY, "The Marriage of Hosea", *Men of God* (London 1963) 66-97; R. GORDIS, "Hosea's Marriage and Message: A New Approach", *HUCA* 25 (1954) 9-35.

⁽¹⁸⁾ WOLFF, *Hosea*, 58; MAYS, *Hosea*, 54.

⁽¹⁹⁾ MAYS, *Hosea*, 54.

⁽²⁰⁾ This is implied in M. J. BUSS, *The Prophetic Word of Hosea: A Morpho-critical Study* (BZAW 111; Berlin 1969) 52.

⁽²¹⁾ In the following paragraphs we shall only deal with vv. 1-5a, as most exegetes agree the remainder of the chapter is a later addition. Similar but not identical treatment of the structure may be found in WOLFF, *Hosea*, 58.

v. 1a

wayyō' mer yhw' 'ēlay
 'ôd lēk 'ēhab- 'iššā
 'āhūbat rēa'

ūmēnā' āpet

And the Lord said to me,
 Go again, love a woman
 who is beloved of a para-
 mour
 and is an adulteress;

v. 1b

kē' ahābat yhw' et bēnē yiśrā' ēl
 wēhēm pōnīm 'el- 'ēlōhīm 'aḥērīm
 wē' ôhābē 'āšišē 'ānābīm

Even as the Lord loves the
 people of Israel
 though they turn to other gods
 and love cakes of raisins

Each part begins with the verb 'hb (to love) and the object of the love is named (a woman; the people). Following that, two descriptions of the object are given, each pointing to illicit behavior. The first involves an explicit relationship with a third party (a paramour; other gods), while the second is allusive and the third party is implicit (an adulteress; love raisin cakes).

v. 3

3aā wā' ômar 'ēlēhā
 yāmīm rabbīm tēšēbī lī

aβ lō' tiznī

aγ wēlō' tihēyī lē' iš

3b wēgam- 'anī 'ēlāyik

And I said to her,
 You must dwell as mine for
 many days⁽²²⁾;
 you shall not play the harlot,
 or belong to another man;
 so will I also be to you.

vv. 4-5a

4aα kī
 yāmīm rabbīm yēšēbū bēnē
 yiśrā' ēl

aβ 'ēn melek wē' ēn šār
 wē' ēn zebaḥ wē' ēn maššēbā

4b wē' ēn 'ēpôd ûtērāpīm

For
 the children of Israel shall
 dwell many days
 without king or prince,
 without sacrifice or pillar,
 without ephod or teraphim.

⁽²²⁾ The idiom yšb el- can be translated "wait for" — cf. WARD, *Hosea*, 49; FREEDMAN and ANDERSEN, *Hosea*, 301.

5aa 'aḥar yāšūbū bēnē yiśrā'ēl	Afterward the children of Israel shall return
aḅ ūbiqšū 'et-yhwh 'ēlōhē- hem...	and seek Yhwh their God...

The two elements are linked by their common opening: *yāmîn rabbîm* ("for many days") and the verb *yšb* ("to dwell").

Both elements also have a similar internal structure: a chiasmic arrangement around a complex of negative clauses. Vv. 3aa and 3b are parallel. They indicate a reciprocity of action: the wife must wait for Hosea just as Hosea shall wait for his wife. The intervening verses are linked by the use of the negative clauses (*lō*, "not") which amplify the meaning of the command "to dwell".

Vv. 4-5a form a similar structural unit. Vv. 4aa and 5aa have as their subject the *bēnē yiśrā'ēl* ("children of Israel"), and involve a paronomasia between *yēšēbū* (*yšb* "to dwell") and *yāšūbū* (*šwb* "to return"). The intervening clauses are linked by the five-fold repetition of the negative *'ēn* (lit. "there is not"; *RSV* "without")⁽²³⁾.

This entire literary unit of vv. 3-5a contains two elements of the symbolic act *Gattung*: command to perform an act (v. 3) and an interpretation of the action (vv. 4-5a). They are related to one another by their common opening phrases and their parallel internal structures.

We have thus highlighted the existence of *two* symbolic act accounts in Hos 3: Yhwh's command to Hosea with its interpretation in v. 1 and its fulfillment in vv. 2-5, and Hosea's command to his wife and its word of interpretation in vv. 3-5a. In the first symbolic act account the fulfillment is not completed in v. 2; the second stage of accomplishment consists of Hosea's involvement of his wife in the symbolic action. The second symbolic action is not an independent action, but forms a part of Hosea's execution of the command from Yhwh⁽²⁴⁾. This is a more complex use of the *Gattung* than that of Jer

(23) This analysis would suggest that Hosea's words to the woman should extend through vv. 4-5. Most recent versions (*RSV*, *JB*, *NAB*, *AB*, *WOLFF*, *MAYS*) limit those words to v. 3; only *WARD*, *Hosea*, 47, incorporates the following verses into Hosea's speech. Formally vv. 4-5a remain an interpretive word whether addressed to the woman or the reader.

(24) *MAYS* proposes that fulfillment of the command could not be recounted because Hosea must wait for his wife to decide, just as Yhwh must wait for

51,59-64a, where Seraiah is delegated to perform a self-contained symbolic act.

In this way Hosea has uniquely exercised his prophetic freedom. He does not use his wife as an object or simply enlist her cooperation in carrying out his commission. Rather, her active involvement is indicated in v. 5, where the verb "return" is something active which requires metanoia⁽²⁵⁾. Hosea's wife, then, is not passive, but an integral and active participant. It is precisely through the use of the elements of the symbolic act *Gattung* — a command and an interpretive word — that she is delegated to become actively involved in the symbolic action of Hosea himself.

III. Conclusion

We have examined the use of a prophetic *Gattung* and a formula by some prophets to delegate a prophetic role to another individual. In the case of the messenger formula, there are occasions in which Yhwh commands the delegation of the role (and the use of the messenger formula and the divine "I"), either explicitly or implicitly. There are other instances in which the delegation appears to be an exercise of the prophet's freedom to choose the words and means most appropriate for the communication of the divine message.

Finally, in our two examples of the delegation of a symbolic act, it appears to be the choice of the prophet to delegate. There is no indication that such actions are the command of Yhwh, although they are probably understood by the prophet as fulfilling a divine commission.

E. Leslie writes: "To Jeremiah's thinking, that which Seraiah was to read, then throw into the Euphrates, was as truly a word of God as though he himself were there proclaiming it"⁽²⁶⁾. The symbolic action is not divested of its power when it is delegated; it is as though the prophet were there performing it.

Israel (*Hosea*, 55). This is borne out by the word "afterward" in v.5 — something further must happen before the command is fulfilled.

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. 14,1-3; and negatively, 6,1-4, in which the people have conversion on their lips but not in their hearts.

⁽²⁶⁾ LESLIE, *Jeremiah*, 216.

The prophets know they are commissioned to preach the word of Yhwh, an effective word, a creative word, a powerful word. But they act in surprising ways by delegating their prophetic role to others: to speak a divine message, to perform a symbolic act, to become actively involved in the prophet's own symbolic action. In those passages the prophet, through the use of a prophetic *Gattung* or a formula, takes on the role of God and the delegate assumes the role of prophet⁽²⁷⁾.

Saint John Provincial Seminary
Plymouth, MI 48170
U.S.A.

Kenneth W. SCHMIDT

SOMMAIRE

Dans l'AT, il y a plusieurs exemples de prophètes qui délèguent à un autre un rôle prophétique, exactement comme Dieu envoie un prophète. La délégation formelle est parfois ordonnée par Dieu et, dans d'autres cas, elle est un exercice de la liberté prophétique. A plusieurs endroits, la formule de messenger et le récit d'un geste symbolique sont employés par un prophète pour déléguer le rôle prophétique, dépassant par là le but originel de ces formes littéraires.

(27) The Mosaic allusions at the beginning and end of this article may be more than simply literary. R. P. CARROLL, "Elisha-Elijah Cycles: Some Remarks on Prophetic Succession in Ancient Israel", *VT* 19 (1969) 400-415, has discussed the Mosaic paradigm of prophetic succession with regard to Elijah and Elisha. Might the phenomenon of prophetic delegation have a similar Mosaic paradigm in the divinely established relationship of Moses and Aaron?

Jonah 2,3-10 : A Rhetorical Critical Study

The study underlying this paper was an experiment in developing a rhetorical critical method. The paper is a logical exposition of the results, and does not pretend to reflect the more dialectical progress of the investigation itself. The exposition is organized in three stages : (i) formal analysis, including an overview of the text, a close reading of the text, and the discernment of a structural pattern according to which the entire piece can be read; (ii) motif analysis; and (iii) interpretation on two levels : that of the text itself and that of the reader. I have made two assumptions about the text of Jonah 2,3-10 that should be rendered explicit. First, the common, albeit not universal, scholarly opinion that Jonah's psalm once stood independent of its present prose context justifies investigating it from that perspective, i.e., as a self-contained literary unity. Secondly, the MT presents a version of that psalm which is available for study, without prejudice to arguments for potential textual emendations⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Much of the scholarly writing on the psalm in Jonah 2 focusses on the relationship between the psalm and its narrative context. This is true of standard diachronic studies as well as of studies more oriented to literary questions. The most recent literature on the book of Jonah includes W. RUDOLPH, *Joel - Amos - Obadja - Jona* (KAT 13/2; Gütersloh 1971); L. C. ALLEN, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (New International Commentary on the Old Testament 5; Grand Rapids 1976); and H. W. WOLFF, *Dodekapropheten 3: Obadja und Jona* (BK 14/3; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1977). Special attention is given to literary questions by J. MAGONET, *Form and Meaning: Studies in Literary Techniques in the Book of Jonah* (Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 2; Bern 1976). The psalm itself is the specific focus of articles by A. R. JOHNSON, "Jonah II.3-10: A Study in Cultic Phantasy", *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (ed. H. H. ROWLEY; Edinburgh 1946); and by G. M. LANDES, "The Kerygma of the Book of Jonah: The Contextual Interpretation of the Jonah Psalm", *Interpr* 21 (1967) 3-31.

I. Formal Analysis

A. *Overview.* Jonah's psalm presents itself as a fifteen-line poem in 3+2 meter⁽²⁾; variations in the meter are fewer in number than is usually the case in comparable Hebrew poetry.

The overall arrangement of the poem is revealed by two verbal indicators: the parallel phrases *wēnāhār y'sōbēbēnī* (v. 4a) and *t'hôm y'sōbēbēnī* (v. 6a), and the recurrence of *'el-hēkal qodšekā* in vv. 5 and 8. These mark the first and last lines of two unequal stanzas. The first stanza (vv. 4-5) is of four lines and is preceded by a unit (v. 3) half its length. The second stanza (vv. 6-8) is of six lines and is followed by a unit (vv. 9-10) half its length. Formally, then, the poem is a chiasitic arrangement of four units, A-B-B'-A', where B and B' are marked by verbal indicators and are twice the length of the corresponding A elements.

B. *Close reading.*

(v. 3) <i>qārā' tî miššārāh lî</i>	<i>'el yhwh wayya'ānēnî</i>
<i>mibbeten š'ôl šiwwa'tî</i>	<i>šāma'tā qôlî</i>

V.3 is a metrically regular couplet (3+2, 3+2), unified by four terminations in *î*. Examples of alliteration and assonance abound; most noticeable are the fourfold *ā* in v. 3aα and the threefold initial *š* in v. 3b. Worthy of particular admiration is the sequence *šiwwa'tî šāma'tā*, preceded and followed immediately by the syllable *-ôl*⁽³⁾.

The couplet manifests external parallelism. Both vv. 3aα and 3bα recount the psalmist's cry. They are chiastically parallel

(2) No scholarly consensus has been reached on the nature of Hebrew meter nor on the most reliable method of scanning Hebrew poetry. The most recent major study of the issue is M. O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake 1980). The option chosen in this paper — that of counting stress groupings rather than syllables — is an entirely pragmatic one: for this particular psalm, syllable count does not seem to yield useful results (e.g., consistent patterns and significant divergencies therefrom), whereas stress count does.

(3) The euphonic sequence *šiwwa'tî šāma'tā* was also noted by RUDOLPH, *Joel - Amos - Obadja - Jona*, 352.

(“cry/from distress” . . . “from Sheol’s belly/entreat”); the elements of v. 3b α describe more vividly both the quality of v. 3a α ’s “cry” and the nature of its “distress”. Vv. 3a β and 3b β recount the divine response. Where v. 3a β focusses attention exclusively on Yahweh, v. 3b β ’s *qôlî* recalls explicitly the psalmist’s cry, forming a conceptual as well as an alliterative inclusion with the opening *qārā’î*.

(v. 4) *wattašlikēnî mešûlāh bilbab*

yammîm

kol-mišbārêkâ wegallêkâ

wenāhār yšōbēbēnî

’ālay ’ābārû

(v. 5) *wa’ānî ’āmartî*

’ak ’ôšip lehabbît

nigrašî minneged ’ênêkâ

’el-hêkal qodšekâ

The first stanza consists of two couplets, each of which contains a departure from the 3+2 meter of v. 3. Each also displays an array of poetic sonant devices.

The first couplet presents an anomalous 4+2, 3+2 scansion (⁴). The first line, as it stands, is poetically weak. Aside from the inclusive internal rhyme (–*ēnî*), it is aurally unimpressive. The overlong phrase *mešûlāh bilbab yammîm* conveys less a sense of emphasis than one of redundancy.

The metric difficulty is paralleled by a grammatical one: the syntactic function of *mešûlāh* is unclear. It seems not to have a nominal function (⁵) but an adverbial one: “you cast me depthwards, into the heart of the seas”, or “you cast me toward the depth [which is] in the heart of the seas” (⁶).

The second line, metrically regular, is also much richer in sound-play. Each hemistich is unified, the first by the internal rhyme (–*êkâ*) and the *k*-alliteration, the second by the repeated initial ‘.

(⁴) By syllable count too the first hemistich is unusually long. It is standard practice to excise either *mešûlāh* or *bilbab* in order to rectify the meter. Reasonable historical-critical arguments can be proffered for either emendation. Rhetorical criticism, on the contrary, prefers to accept the received text as given, rather than to attempt reconstruction of an earlier reading, no matter how probable.

(⁵) Cp. Mic 7,19: *wetašlik bimsûlôt yām* . . .

(⁶) Could *mšwlh* be an otherwise unattested formation *māšôl* (on the analogy of *māqôm*; cp. the plural forms *meqômôt* and *mešôlôt*, *mešôlôt*), with directive –*āh*?

The couplet has long posed notorious problems for commentators. Standard procedure is to read the couplet as 3+2, 3+2, each line being an independent sentence⁽⁸⁾. Problems involved in such a reading are the preposition in *l'qışbê* (usually translated "at"); the awkward placing of the caesura after *b'riḥêhā* rather than before it (usually not adverted to); and the overloaded syntax of the couplet's second line (variously treated). The solution lies in reading the couplet as chiastically arranged, both metrically (3+2, 2+3) and syntactically⁽⁹⁾:

Weeds [were] wrapped round my head;
 to the mountains' roots
 I went down [and] to the Land;
 Her gatebars [were] behind me forever.

The first and last hemistichs are nominal propositions. The central phrases contain two double-duty functions: the preposition in *l'qışbê* carries through to *hā'āreš*, and the verb *yāradtî* governs both.

Each part of the couplet is marked by sonant devices: the first hemistich by *û* and a sibilant alliteration (*s, š*); the central phrases by three repetitions of the syllable *-ār*; the last hemistich by alliteration of initial *b*, of *'*, and of *l*.

The second half of the stanza offers no difficulties of meter or syntax. Among the noteworthy poetic devices are a striking *a*-assonance in the first hemistic of v. 7b, and a *t-ṭ* alliteration that ties together the first three hemistichs of the couplet. V.8a offers an example of a broken construct chain. The word order has the effect of placing *napšî* rather than the weak prepositional phrase *'ālay* in the place of greater emphasis, and recalls v. 6a, where *nepeš* has the same position.

In each half of the stanza, the couplet enlarges upon the event announced in the single line.

V. 6a describes the psalmist's distress in terms of drowning. Two specific images are used: "being surrounded" (*'āpāpûnî* and *y'sōbēbēnî*) and "ultimate death" (*nepeš* and *t'hôm*). The couplet

⁽⁸⁾ For example, the *RSV* (reading 3+2, 2+3) renders: "weeds were wrapped about my head / at the roots of the mountains. // I went down to the land / whose bars closed upon me for ever".

⁽⁹⁾ WOLFF, *Dodekapropheton*, 105, notes the metric chiasm but does not draw any syntactic conclusions.

elaborates these two images, and arranges them according to the same chiastic pattern seen in its meter and syntax: the first and last hemistichs describe the terror of being trapped and held, unable to break free; the central phrases speak of sinking to the ultimate depths, to the eternal abode of death⁽¹⁰⁾.

V. 7b announces the saving act of God. In the couplet, the psalmist describes how his last conscious thought had been a remembrance of Yahweh, and how this thought must have been received as an effective prayer for salvation.

- | | | |
|---------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (v. 9) | <i>mšammērîm hablê-šāw'</i> | <i>ḥasdām ya'āzōbû</i> |
| (v. 10) | <i>wa'ānî bēqôl tôdāh</i> | <i>'ezbēḥāh-lāk</i> |
| | <i>'āšer nādartî 'āšallēmāh</i> | <i>yēšû'ātāh lēyhwh</i> |

The concluding lines continue the 3 + 2 meter without irregularity. The single line + couplet pattern established in the second stanza is followed in these three lines as well.

The single line (v. 9) is unified by a sibilant alliteration (š-š-s-z); the repeated *m* of *mšammērîm*⁽¹¹⁾ is picked up in the second hemistich by *ḥasdām*. There is, further, a chiastic structure on two levels. Grammatically, two verbal forms surround two nominal forms; semantically, two antithetic attitudes ("clinging"/"abandoning") surround two abstractions ("empty nothings"/"loyalty").

The couplet exhibits a rich array of poetic devices. The second and third hemistichs in particular (v. 10aβγ) are welded together by the inclusion with two cohortatives, by the alliterative sequence of initial 'ez... 'āš... 'āš, and by the chiasmus of liquid sounds *l-r-r-l*. V.10α is marked by an *ô*-assonance, and the final hemistich (v. 10b) a *y*-alliteration.

The couplet is also an example of chiastic parallelism, the second member being more precise than the first. V.10αγ is probably epexegetical: the sacrifices to be offered are the ones the psalmist has already vowed. The chiastic structure further shows that the exclamation of v. 10b is not simply an appropriate cultic cry to bring the

⁽¹⁰⁾ Note that the words of "being surrounded" and of "ultimate death" are found in a similar chiastic pattern in v. 6a.

⁽¹¹⁾ Or perhaps *mšammērê-mî* with *mem*-enclitic? Cp. H. D. HUMMEL, "Enclitic *Mem* in Early Northwest Semitic, Especially Hebrew", *JBL* 76 (1957) 99.

psalm to a close, but is in fact the psalmist's very *qôl tôdāh* (v. 10aα) accompanying his sacrifice⁽¹²⁾.

C. Structural pattern. The couplet in v. 3 stands as an introduction to the whole poem. It presents the drama of distress, entreaty, and salvation of which the entire psalm is an artful elaboration. In particular, v. 3a serves as this introduction. The parallel v. 3b, by shifting to the second person (*šāma'tā*), intensifies the mood of immediacy, the attitude of prayer, and the sense of divine presence, and prepares the transition to the first stanza, which addresses Yahweh in the second person throughout.

The first stanza corresponds to the first hemistich of the introductory couplet (v. 3aα). It gives a more elaborate description of the psalmist's distress, and recounts verbally the cry he made. This leads the psalmist's audience to anticipate the next element, an account of the divine answer.

Unexpectedly, the account of the divine answer is delayed by a renewed description of the psalmist's distress (vv. 6-7a). If the similarity of the description in v. 4 is to be related to v. 3aα, the appearance of *rehôm*, *qışbê harîm*, and *hā'āreš* in these verses recalls more pointedly the *beṭen š'ôl* of v. 3ba.

Finally, the tale of the divine rescue is told. Vv. 7b-8 correspond to the second hemistichs of the opening lines (vv. 3aβ, 3bβ)⁽¹³⁾. The themes of the introductory couplet have now received their full development, the narrative is complete, the climax has been achieved. All that remains for the psalmist is to draw out the lesson of the event. This he will do in the concluding lines.

The abstract character of v. 9 differentiates it from the otherwise narrative material of the psalm. Its function in the ensemble is less to illustrate or elaborate a particular event than to focus attention on the central message of the whole: the *hesed* of Yahweh. This will be discussed further below.

(12) For a chiasmic reading of v. 10 based on syllable count, cp. P. AUFRET, "'Pivot Pattern': Nouveaux Exemples", *VT* 28 (1978) 103-104.

(13) Attention has occasionally been called to the awkwardness of mentioning the psalmist's prayer for rescue (v. 8) after the rescue itself has been recounted (v. 7). The reverse of expected chronological order has a significance that will be considered in a later part of this paper. It might be noted, however, that the two events are mentioned in the same order in vv. 3aβ and 3bβ.

The concluding couplet achieves an elegant pattern of inclusion to bring the psalm to its end. The *qôl* of the second line has become the *qôl tôdāh* of the second last line. The "cry from distress" of the first line is answered by the cultic cry of celebration in the last. And the divine name in the first line is matched by the final word of the psalm.

II. Motif Analysis

The structural arrangement of the text, as it has been exposed in the preceding section, supplies the background against which the development of significant (i.e., "message-bearing") motifs can be analyzed. Those motifs are two: spatial movement, and the presence/absence of Yahweh.

Words and images of spatial movement do not occur in the opening couplet. Beginning with *tašlikēnî* in the first stanza, the dominant sense is of outward horizontal movement. Some words do carry nuances of verticality (*mēšûlāh*, *'ālay*, and, ambiguously, *bilbab yammīm*). But the general impression is of horizontal movement, whether of the psalmist (*tašlikēnî*, *nigraštî*, *minneged*) or of the waves and breakers (*'ābārû*) acting upon him. The overall effect is one of "distancing".

In vv. 6-7a, downward vertical movement dominates. The poet describes his submersion to the throat, then to the head; words of depth appear, such as *ʿhôm*, *qišbê hārīm*, *hā'āreš*; and finally, of course, the verb *yāradtî* is used. The overall effect is one of "sinking".

Vv. 7b-8 systematically reverse first the vertical movement (*watta'al*), then the horizontal distancing (v. 8b).

Vv. 9-10, like the introductory couplet, contain no words or images of movement. But the cultic character of v. 10 suggests that the horizontal return has reached its goal in the temple, from which the psalmist had felt himself so isolated (v. 5).

In the introductory couplet and first stanza of the psalm, Yahweh is mentioned in every line — in v. 3a by name, in the next five lines by second person pronominal suffixes or verbal forms.

Vv. 6-7a contain no reference at all to Yahweh.

In v. 7b, Yahweh reappears in the verbal form *watta'al*, and in the solemn phrase *yhwh 'elōhāy*. The last five lines each contain either the name (vv. 8a, 10b), an allusive title (*ḥasdām*, v. 9), or a pronominal suffix.

The two motifs are clearly parallel in their development. In each case, vv. 3-5 and vv. 6-7a mark two stages of development, and v. 7b effects a reversal. The reversal continues through the rest of the psalm.

But the two motifs also interact with one another. This is seen most clearly in *tašlikēnî*, where it is Yahweh's action that begins the first stage of the spatial movement, and in *watta'al*, where Yahweh's sudden reappearance initiates the reversal of the second stage of spatial movement.

III. Interpretation

Attention to the interaction of the two motifs discussed above will lead to an interpretation of the psalm. We will focus on this interaction at three points: the first stage of development (vv. 3-5), the second stage (vv. 6-7a), and the reversal (v. 7b).

A. The level of the text. The horizontal movement of the first stanza is experienced by the psalmist as distress because it is a distancing from Yahweh and from Yahweh's temple. Moreover, the distancing is itself Yahweh's doing. There is no indication that the poet feels his distress as punishment; to the contrary, the nostalgic longing with which he remembers the temple bespeaks his devotion and implies his innocence. His physical separation from Yahweh is a sign of the more poignant distress of apparently unwarranted moral separation. The focus of attention is backwards, toward Yahweh, and the psalmist's tragedy is abandonment.

The vertical movement of vv. 6-7a takes place in the absence of Yahweh; the verbal fabric of the poem reflects the experience of the poet. No longer upheld by his God, the psalmist feels himself sinking helplessly and hopelessly to the netherworld. Alone, he cannot escape his fate; the eternal abode of death is his inevitable destination. The focus of his attention is forward, toward Sheol, and to the tragedy of abandonment is added the terror of death.

The first hemistich — indeed, the first word — of v. 7b marks the reversal of both motifs, spatial movement and divine absence/presence. The pivotal importance of the line is reflected in the second hemistich, where the solemn phrase *yhw̄h 'elōhāy*, unique in the poem, stands alone. The two hemistichs bring to subtle expression the double "message" of the psalm: Yahweh's salvation is a gift; and Yahweh's salvation is an act of faithfulness.

First, Yahweh's salvation is a gift. With the verb *watta'al*, Yahweh appears on the scene abruptly and actively. By making Yahweh the subject of the verb, the psalmist is able to emphasize the divine initiative. By deferring the account of his prayer *in extremis* to v. 8, he is able to present the divine intervention as independent of that prayer, as unpreconditioned and unprompted. In his helplessness, the psalmist experiences the divine act of deliverance first and foremost as gratuitous, as an irruption into his desperate straits. He has prayed (v. 8) and, on reflection, can even refer to God's salvation as an "answer" (v. 3a). But his immediate experience is of absence shattered by presence, of "being saved" emerging out of hopelessness, of prevenient graciousness, unmerited and sovereignly free.

Secondly, Yahweh's salvation is an act of faithfulness. The phrase with which the line ends, *yhwh 'elōhāy*, does not merely sound a solemn note. It refers explicitly to the relationship between the psalmist and *his* God⁽¹⁴⁾. The entire drama of distress, entreaty, and salvation has been played out in the context of that relationship. The loyalties of both God and worshipper have been tested. The devotee has proven unwavering by his longing for the temple (v. 5), and by remembering Yahweh with his last conscious thought (v. 8). So too has the deity shown himself faithful, by rescuing the psalmist.

In this light the concluding lines (vv. 9-10) are seen to epitomize the whole psalm, and the abstractions of v. 9 take on very concrete connotations. The polarity of "clinging" and "abandoning" refers to worshippers' attitudes. Since "empty nothings" is recognized as a standard reference to idols, it seems likely that the antithesis is to be carried out: "loyalty" (*ḥesed*) is a personified reference to Yahweh, the God of the covenant⁽¹⁵⁾; and the "emptiness" of idols is to be understood as the worthlessness of their promises and the unreliability of their action on a worshipper's behalf. In contrast to those who cling to such idols, and in praise of the God who is *ḥesed*, the psalmist faithfully fulfills the sacrificial vows he made, with a glad and "grateful voice".

(14) Cp. the brief remark by RUDOLPH, *Joel - Amos - Obadja - Jona*, 353.

(15) The personalized use of *ḥesed* is also remarked by LANDES, "The Kerygma", 7.

B. The level of the reader. The lessons learned and conveyed by the psalmist are not new. On the contrary, they are a fundamental and traditional understanding of Yahweh, the faithful and free. What is new is *this* experience, in which the old dogmas have come alive for *this* psalmist, and *this* poetic expression, through which we too are enabled to experience the old truths anew.

The psalmist recreates for us his own experience of abandonment and doom. The sight of a hostile Yahweh driving away an apparently guiltless person, and then abandoning him to certain death, cannot leave *us* unmoved either. His God is ours, whom we thought faithful and merciful; and our bewilderment at such callous disloyalty and injustice is an experience analogous to the psalmist's abandonment. The disappearance from the text of references to Yahweh reflects for us as well as for him the experience of the divine absence, the negation (to put it in more modern terms) of our "God-concept".

Yahweh's sudden reappearance brings salvation to the psalmist; to us too it brings relief of bewilderment and restoration of our threatened faith. For both him and us, Yahweh's reappearance is both the result of and the renewed proof of Yahweh's free and unfailing *hesed*. And so we are led to join him in his thankful praise of the faithful God to whom alone salvation belongs.

St. John's Provincial Seminary
44011 Five Mile Rd.
Plymouth, MI 48170
U.S.A.

Jerome T. WALSH

SOMMAIRE

L'article analyse Jon 2,3-10 indépendamment de son contexte en prose. Il comprend: (1) une analyse formelle, incluant une lecture précise et une étude des modèles structuraux sous-jacents; (2) une analyse des motifs; (3) une interprétation à deux niveaux, celui du texte et celui du lecteur. L'analyse formelle révèle un texte poétique riche, arrangé en chiasme: vv. 3/4-5//6-8/9-10. L'analyse des motifs examine deux éléments: le mouvement spatial et la présence/absence de Yhwh, et leur interaction. Le psaume est interprété comme l'expérience d'un psalmiste fidèle abandonné, puis sauvé par Yhwh. L'expression textuelle crée une expérience analogue chez le lecteur, qui est ainsi entraîné dans la louange qui termine la prière.

A Critique of Two Recent Metrical Systems*

In the field of Hebrew poetics, the study of meter is an area of importance and difficulty. If an accurate description of the Biblical Hebrew metrical system could be discovered, not only would the rhythmical pattern of Hebrew poems be elucidated, but researchers would also have a reliable tool to use to determine the original text of the poem. In addition, the establishment of the metrical structure of a Hebrew poem would help the exegete to provide a clear and objective standard by which the poetic line could be divided. Nevertheless, up to this day, no single approach to Hebrew meter has been presented with enough persuasion to convince even a majority of scholars of its validity.

In the past, most scholars⁽¹⁾ have accepted the Ley-Sievers-Budde⁽²⁾ system of accentual meter. Yet, many modern researchers⁽³⁾ are disenchanted with this approach because it does not offer consistent results and often involves many emendations. As a result, several new proposals have been offered towards a solution of the problem of Hebrew meter. This study will examine two of these

*I would like to thank both W. Randall Garr and R. R. Wilson of Yale University for reading and commenting on this paper. While not necessarily agreeing with the conclusions, their insights were extremely helpful. An earlier version of this paper was delivered as a lecture in November of 1980 at Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri.

(1) For a brief summary of the history of the study of Hebrew meter, see D. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter* (Missoula, Montana 1976) 1-10.

(2) J. LEY, *Grundzüge der Rhythmus, des Vers- und Strophenbaues in der hebräischen Poesie* (Halle 1875); IDEM, *Die Metrischen Formen der hebräischen Poesie* (Leipzig 1886); IDEM, *Leitfaden der Metrik der hebräischen Poesie* (Halle 1887); K. BUDDE, "Das hebräische Klagelied", *ZAW* 2 (1882) 1-52; E. SIEVERS, *Metrische Studien. I: Studien zur hebräischen Metrik* (Leipzig 1901); IDEM, II: *Die hebräische Genesis* (Leipzig 1904).

(3) D. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 1-10.

new approaches⁽⁴⁾, in order to determine how satisfactorily they describe the poems' rhythmical structure. These two systems were chosen for analysis for different reasons. On the one hand, the Cross-Freedman-Stuart method of counting syllables is becoming increasingly popular in Old Testament and Ugaritic studies. For this reason, it merits examination. On the other hand, the second method here under analysis, that of the Polish linguist Jerzy Kuryłowicz, has only recently come to the attention of Old Testament scholars and shows promise of explaining some of the problems of Hebrew metrics.

In order to examine these two systems of metrics, the following method will be employed. First, both the syllable counting and syntactic-accentual⁽⁵⁾ approach will be described. Both systems will then be applied to two Old Testament poems, chosen from two different chronological periods. These are Deut 33 (dated by most to the 12th or 11th century B.C.), and Jer 12 (7th century). Poems from different periods have been selected for analysis because, as Segert has pointed out⁽⁶⁾, Hebrew meter *may* have changed during its long history. Thus one metrical system may be effective in one period but not in another. Lastly, the analysis of these poems will show the advantages and disadvantages of both the systems.

(4) Besides the two approaches analyzed in the present paper, there have been other new suggestions in regard to the correct manner of scanning Hebrew (and Ugaritic) poetry. For example, see H. KOSMALA, "Form and Structure in Ancient Hebrew Poetry", *VT* 14 (1964) 423-455; IDEM, "Form and Structure of Ancient Hebrew Poetry (continued)", *VT* 16 (1966) 152-180; B. MARGALIT, "Introduction to Ugaritic Prosody", *Ugarit-Forschungen* 7 (1975) 289-313; S. SEGERT, "Vorarbeiten zur hebräischen Metrik", *ArOr* 21 (1953) 481-542; IDEM, "Vorarbeiten zur hebräischen Metrik, II", *ArOr* 25 (1957) 190-200; and S. B. PARKER, "Parallelism and Prosody in Ugaritic Narrative Verse", *Ugarit-Forschungen* 6 (1974) 283-294. For the position that Ugaritic (and Hebrew) poetry does not yield to metric analysis, see G. D. YOUNG, "Ugaritic Prosody", *JNES* 9 (1950) 124-133.

(5) For convenience sake, I have labelled Kuryłowicz' method "syntactic-accentual", feeling that it accurately describes the main points of the method.

(6) S. SEGERT, "Vorarbeiten, I and II".

Syllable-Count Meter

Following their teacher W.F. Albright⁽⁷⁾, Frank Cross and David Noel Freedman adopted the Ley-Sievers-Budde approach to Hebrew meter in their early writings⁽⁸⁾. This approach counts only *accented* syllables and was the dominant theory of the day even outside of the Albright circle.

As early as 1960, however, Freedman for the first time discussed the possibility of counting syllables in order to determine the metric structure of an Old Testament poem. In his article "Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry," he states:

It may be suggested, however, that the early Israelites had a strong sense of meter, that is, a conscious poetic measurement, more precise than the commonly accepted accentual system, though falling far short of the quantitative metrical systems of Greek or Latin verse. While syllable-counting is both imprecise and pedestrian, it affords a clue to the rhythmic structure of Hebrew poetry, and an occasional glimpse at the Israelite poet composing his verse⁽⁹⁾.

While neither Freedman nor anyone else developed this system in the sixties⁽¹⁰⁾, many articles in the past decade were devoted to the structural analysis of individual Hebrew poems on the basis of syllable counting. Through the work of Cross⁽¹¹⁾, Freedman⁽¹²⁾,

(7) W. F. ALBRIGHT, "The Oracles of Balaam", *JBL* 63 (1944) 207-233; IDEM, "The Old Testament and Canaanite Language and Literature", *CBQ* 7 (1945) 5-31; IDEM, "The Psalm of Habakkuk" in H. H. ROWLEY (ed.), *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (Edinburgh 1957); IDEM, "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 33", *VT* 9 (1959) 339-346; IDEM, *Yahweh and the God of Canaan* (Garden City, N. Y. 1965).

(8) F. M. CROSS and D. N. FREEDMAN, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving: II Samuel 22 - Psalm 18", *JBL* 72 (1953) 15-34; IDEM, "The Song of Miriam", *JNES* 14 (1955) 237-250; IDEM, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (Missoula, Montana 1954).

(9) D. N. FREEDMAN, "Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry", *ZAW* 72 (1960) 167.

(10) With the exception of D. N. FREEDMAN, "The Structure of Job 3", *Bib* 49 (1968) 503-510.

(11) F. M. CROSS, "Prose and Poetry in the Mythic and Epic Texts from Ugarit", *HTR* 67 (1974) 1-15.

(12) In addition to articles cited above, note D. N. FREEDMAN, "The Structure of Psalm 137", in H. GOEDICKE (ed.), *Near Eastern Studies in Hon-*

their students (Stuart⁽¹³⁾, Christensen⁽¹⁴⁾, Hanson⁽¹⁵⁾, Ehlen⁽¹⁶⁾) and colleagues (Boling⁽¹⁷⁾, Culley⁽¹⁸⁾, Dahood⁽¹⁹⁾, and Stek⁽²⁰⁾) a considerable number of ancient Hebrew poems have been treated, starting with the earliest Hebrew poems, through the eighth century Hebrew prophets (Christensen), and a seventh century plaque from Arslan Tash⁽²¹⁾, to late Biblical poetry and even a poem from Qumran⁽²²⁾.

or of William Foxwell Albright (Baltimore 1971) 187-205; IDEM, "The Refrain in David's Lament over Saul and Jonathan" in *Ex Orbe Religionum: Studia Geo Widengren* (vol. 1) (Leiden 1972) 115-126; IDEM, "Acrostics and Metrics in Hebrew Poetry", *HTR* 65 (1972) 367-392; IDEM, "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15", in BREAM, HEIM and MOORE (eds.), *A Light unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob C. Myers* (Philadelphia 1974) 163-203; IDEM, "Divine Names and Titles in Early Hebrew Poetry", in F. M. CROSS (ed.), *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (Garden City 1976) 55-107; IDEM, "The Twenty-Third Psalm", in Louis L. ORLIN (ed.), *Michigan Oriental Studies in Honor of George C. Cameron* (Ann Arbor 1976) 139-166; IDEM, "Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry", *JBL* 96 (1977) 5-26; IDEM, "Psalm 113 and the Song of Hannah", *Eretz Israel* 14 (1978) 56-69; D. N. FREEDMAN and C. F. HYLAND, "Psalm 29: A Structural Analysis", *HTR* 66 (1973) 237-256.

⁽¹³⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry*.

⁽¹⁴⁾ D. L. CHRISTENSEN, "The Prosodic Structure of Amos 1-2", *HTR* 67 (1975) 427-436; IDEM, "The Acrostic of Nahum Reconsidered", *ZAW* 87 (1975) 17-30.

⁽¹⁵⁾ P. D. HANSON, "The Song of Heshbon and David's Nîr", *HTR* 61 (1968) 279-320; IDEM, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, 2nd ed., 1979).

⁽¹⁶⁾ A. EHLEN, "The Poetic Structure of a Hodayah from Qumran", Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1970.

⁽¹⁷⁾ R. G. BOLING, *Judges* (AB GA; Garden City 1975).

⁽¹⁸⁾ R. C. CULLEY, "Metrical Analysis of Classical Hebrew Poetry", in J. W. WEVERS and D. D. REDFORD (eds.), *Essays on the Ancient Semitic World* (Toronto 1970).

⁽¹⁹⁾ M. DAHOOD, "A New Metrical Pattern in Biblical Poetry", *CBQ* 29 (1967) 574-579.

⁽²⁰⁾ J. H. STEK, "The Stylistics of Hebrew Poetry", *Calvin Theological Journal* 9 (1974) 190-200.

⁽²¹⁾ F. M. CROSS and R. J. SALEY, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of Seventh Century B. C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria", *BASOR* 197 (1970) 42-49.

⁽²²⁾ A. EHLEN, "Poetic Structure of a Hodayah".

Methodology

Even though a number of studies have applied syllable counting to poems, theoretical discussions of methodology have been limited to two. Freedman has best summarized⁽²³⁾ his views in his article "Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry"⁽²⁴⁾. Douglas Stuart has also dealt extensively with methodology in a dissertation which he completed under F.M. Cross at Harvard⁽²⁵⁾.

A close examination of these writings show that, while some fundamental and important differences remain between them, Freedman and Stuart hold many ideas in common. For example, they agree that, since there is no explanation of Old Testament metrics by the ancient Israelites themselves, one must be devised inductively⁽²⁶⁾; they also agree that the method which shows the symmetry of the poem in the simplest and most detailed manner is best. They, of course, also agree on the fact that syllable counting is the method which meets their aims most effectively.

A second major similarity between Freedman and Stuart is that neither believes that the ancient Israelite poet consciously counted the syllables. Even though the poet was not consciously counting syllables while composing, however, the result, according to Freedman at least, will "inevitably" be a perfectly structured poem⁽²⁷⁾.

While agreeing on the above points, Freedman and Stuart disagree on the oral origin of the poetry. According to Stuart (and his teacher Cross), both Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry show signs of oral composition and recitation. These signs include the presence of formula, thematic structure and lack of enjambment⁽²⁸⁾. Heavily dependent upon the work of the Harvard classical scholars, M. Parry and A. Lord, Stuart asserts that the presence of a high percentage of formula demonstrates a consistent metrical pattern in a poem⁽²⁹⁾.

(23) "Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy" is his most comprehensive summary of the method, but many of his works which deal with individual psalms also present brief methodological statements.

(24) *JBL* 96 (1977) 5-26.

(25) D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*.

(26) This is unlike studies of classical meter where Aristotle's *Poetics* is available.

(27) D. N. FREEDMAN, "Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy", 15.

(28) D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 10.

(29) As a matter of fact, Parry defined the formula in Homer as "a group

In other words, the ancient Israelite or Canaanite poet had a "stock-pile" of formulae which he could use during recitation. In order to make this possible, there had to be a well-defined structure to the metrical pattern of the poem he was reciting. The poem itself then was not memorized by the bard; rather he spontaneously composed it at each recitation. The inventory of traditional formula as well as the consistent metrical pattern gave the singer this ability. Thus one of the motivating factors in Cross and Stuart's metrical analysis, as opposed to Freedman, is the assumption that the poems were originally composed orally.

Two additional differences between Stuart and Freedman must be taken into account in this analysis. First, there is a basic disagreement in regard to their approaches to the MT. Freedman takes a very conservative position. In his own words: "...it would be methodologically untenable to emend the text in the interests of a certain metrical or strophic structure or to base such a structure on an emended text"⁽³⁰⁾. As a result, Freedman bases his analysis of Old Testament poems on the MT and its vocalization. There are, however, certain exceptions to this rule. For example, he will occasionally emend the text in favor of what he considers to be the original state of the text (e.g. he omits the conjunction at the beginning of a colon, 'et and 'ašer are omitted as prosaic elements, etc.). Yet, Freedman believes that "the differences (in terms of changing the syllable count) are very small"⁽³¹⁾ between using the Massoretic text and his type of reconstructed text. At the opposite extreme, Stuart radically emends the text, in order to reconstruct the original state of the text. While he states that an emendation should not be considered on metric grounds alone⁽³²⁾, he also says that the analyst may have to 'improve' the MT without versional evidence, even in cases where the MT is in perfectly good condition⁽³³⁾.

A second area of disagreement between the two scholars concerns the nature of the results which a syllable count will give.

of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea", cited in ROBERT B. COOTE, "The Application of the Oral Theory to Biblical Hebrew Literature", *Semeia* 5 (1976) 52.

⁽³⁰⁾ D. N. FREEDMAN, "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15", 163.

⁽³¹⁾ D. N. FREEDMAN, "Psalm 113 and the Song of Hannah", 58.

⁽³²⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 15.

⁽³³⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 21.

While Stuart⁽³⁴⁾ holds that a syllable count yields the meter of a poem, Freedman emphasizes that syllable counting is not a 'magical'⁽³⁵⁾ key which gets to the heart of a Hebrew poem, but simply a convenient way to describe the structure of a poem⁽³⁶⁾. This difference between Freedman and Stuart also explains their reactions to other methods of metric analysis. Freedman is open to virtually any approach to Hebrew meter, but still holds to the primacy of syllable counting. He thinks that "the only requirement of an adequate methodology is to be consistent"⁽³⁷⁾. As a result, in his analysis of Exod 15⁽³⁸⁾, he uses three different methods, counting accents; counting vowel quality; and counting syllables. While Freedman is open to the use of other metrical tools, Stuart believes that the syllable count method is the only suitable one.

Tools for Analysis

Proponents of the syllable counting school use two main tools. The first is the reconstruction and revocalization of the text. It has

(³⁴) While it is true that he leaves the question of internal feet within the poetic line an unanswered question, he definitely believes that syllable counting solves the question of meter.

(³⁵) D. N. FREEDMAN, "Pottery, Poetry and Prophecy", 10.

(³⁶) M. O'CONNOR, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, Indiana 1980), 30-35 argues that: "Neither Freedman nor Culley has ever written of syllabic meter; they use syllable counting as a way of describing features of verse structure which are intuitively recognizable but which have so far resisted descriptive efforts. . . ." He further accuses Stuart and Cooper of not recognizing this fact. Though O'Connor's book originally was a dissertation under the direction of Freedman, his understanding of Freedman needs modification. In Freedman's earlier writings, he obviously relates the counting of syllables to *metrical* analysis. For example, after translating and counting the syllables of Psalm 29, FREEDMAN and HYLAND, "Psalm 29", 738 state: "In determining *metrical* patterns we have followed a syllable-counting method". At the end of his study of Job 3, FREEDMAN, "The Structure of Job 3", 506, says that he will "append a final note on the feasibility of syllable-counting in determining metric structure". He then, through counting syllables, demonstrates the chapter's "metrical uniformity" (508). It is only in his most recent writings that Freedman shows a propensity to disassociate syllable counting from metrical analysis. D. N. FREEDMAN and F. I. ANDERSON, *Hosea* (AB 24; Garden City, New York 1980) 76, 77.

(³⁷) D. N. FREEDMAN, "Psalm 113 and the Song of Hannah", 57.

(³⁸) D. N. FREEDMAN, "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15".

already been mentioned that the extent to which such work takes place constitutes a point of considerable disagreement. Nonetheless, they all reconstruct the text to a certain degree before they scan it. Stuart believes that it is necessary to restore the text to its state at the time of composition, in order to do an effective job of delineating the metric structure of the poem, and he has a long list of rules in order to accomplish this goal⁽³⁹⁾. Freedman also mentions a few of these rules like the contraction of diphthongs in the North, the original monosyllabic nature of segolates etc. Stuart goes much further, however, and even mentions principles which would not affect syllable count⁽⁴⁰⁾.

As will be pointed out below, some of his rules allow him to vacillate on the number of syllables in a line and facilitate the process of discovering 'metrically' equivalent cola. A second tool is mentioned by both Cross⁽⁴¹⁾ and Stuart⁽⁴²⁾, and that tool helps the analyst get a quick overview of the pattern of the relative lengths of the cola in a poem. This is done simply by designating a colon which is between 3 and 5 syllables as *breve* and one between 8 and 13 as *longum*.

Results and Conclusions of the School

After scanning many poems, members of the syllable counting school have come to some conclusions concerning the nature of meter in the Old Testament. There is general agreement that the meter throughout the Hebrew Bible⁽⁴³⁾ is mixed⁽⁴⁴⁾. This means that there

⁽³⁹⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 24-28.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ See most of the rules under "Vocalisation", D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 27-28.

⁽⁴¹⁾ F. M. CROSS, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth", *Journal for Theology and the Church* 5 (1968) 1-25.

⁽⁴²⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 12.

⁽⁴³⁾ And Ugaritic for that matter.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 14-15, defines three kinds of meter which appear in Hebrew poetry. First, there is mixed meter where cola within bicola are metrically equivalent but bear no relationship to other bicola. Second, there is irregular meter where there is no balance even within bicola. And last there is unbalanced meter which occurs when the bicola have different counts but form a broader pattern with other bicola in the poem.

is frequent agreement in the number of syllables between the cola of a bicolon or tricolon⁽⁴⁵⁾, but that there is no detectable wider pattern. Stuart notes the existence of some irregular meters⁽⁴⁶⁾; that is, meters which show no agreement between cola⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Syntactic-Accentual Meter

A second contemporary approach to Hebrew meter is formulated by the Polish linguist Jerzy Kuryłowicz⁽⁴⁸⁾ and adopted by Alan Cooper⁽⁴⁹⁾. Their syntactic-accentual meter⁽⁵⁰⁾ has not yet been applied by any other student of Hebrew poetry⁽⁵¹⁾, so the following exposition of this approach will be restricted to the writings of these two men.

Kuryłowicz makes clear the central principle of his innovative system of Hebrew poetry by contrasting it with the well-known approach of Sievers⁽⁵²⁾. He states that Sievers conceived meter as each word accent having a single metrical stress. For Kuryłowicz, though, each word *complex* has one and only one metrically significant accent. As he states it: "Sievers' principal tenet 'no accented syllable (of the colloquial language) can function as a metrical *thesis*' has been replaced by 'an *arsis* is always represented by an *accented*

⁽⁴⁵⁾ A hypothetical example of a mixed pattern is 8:8::7:7::6:6, etc.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 14, 15.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Example: 7:5::7:8, etc.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ J. KURYŁOWICZ, *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics* (Wrocław 1972) and J. KURYŁOWICZ, *Metrik und Sprachgeschichte* (Wrocław 1975).

⁽⁴⁹⁾ A. M. COOPER, "Biblical Poetics: A Linguistic Approach", Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University, 1976.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ See footnote 5.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Similar to it, however, is the word-meter of researchers, like MARGALIT, "Introduction to Ugaritic Prosody", 1973, KOSMALA, "Form and Structure I and II", and SEGERT, "Vorarbeiten I and II", (for the earliest period of Hebrew poetry). The main difference from Kuryłowicz' approach is the fact that he counts syntactical units rather than individual words. While word metrists would not give prefixed prepositions, conjunctions, etc. a separate stress, Kuryłowicz would go further and state that some independent words (like nouns and verbs) lose their accent when considered from a metrical viewpoint.

⁽⁵²⁾ KURYŁOWICZ, *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics*, 166.

syllable (of the colloquial language)'”(53). In other words, Sievers counted every word accent whereas Kuryłowicz allows for the possibility that a word-accent may not be metrically significant, i.e., that an accented syllable *may* not act as a metrical *arsis*. In missing this point, Kuryłowicz felt that Sievers had missed the 'key' to the understanding of Hebrew meter.

Two important concepts are frequently found in Kuryłowicz' writings, and their elucidation is crucial to understand his system of metrical analysis. These two notions are 1) *sandhi* and 2) *accentus dominus* and *accentus servus*. The two are closely related and will be treated together.

Sandhi refers to the assimilation which takes place between two words when they are pronounced without an internal pause. He established the existence of this phenomenon on the basis of the spirantization of initial *begadkefat* letters within members of a metrical unit. The metrical purpose of *sandhi*, according to Kuryłowicz, was simply the weakening of secondary accents to the point where they carried no metrical value. As he states: "Its (*sandhi*'s) function was to confer the status of *thesis* to syllables which normally carried at least a weakened (secondary) stress" (54).

Sandhi leads to a discussion of *accentus dominus* and *accentus servus*. Due to *sandhi*, Kuryłowicz posits: "...the metrical integration of the hemistich into a constant number of word-complexes, each of them carrying one metrical accent" (55). In other words, Kuryłowicz asserts that proclitics, enclitics and even individual words often lose their accent in Hebrew meter. The accent on a word in a Hebrew poem is either metrically significant (*accentus dominus*) or is secondary and weakened (*accentus servus*). In the application of the method, the analyst must draw an absolute distinction between these two and must treat the latter, namely *accentus servus*, as non-existent:

The metrical transformation of a spoken text consists in Heb. in the replacement of the gradual differences of word-stress by

(53) Kuryłowicz uses the term "*thesis*" to refer to unaccented words and "*arsis*" to refer to those which are accented. While this is the exact opposite of the original meaning of these words, it fits in with modern usage.

(54) J. KURYŁOWICZ, *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics*, 175.

(55) J. KURYŁOWICZ, *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics*, 167.

a simple opposition between *accent* and *lack of accent*, i.e. in the polarization between strong and weak syntactical accents, sanctioned by *metrical sandhi*⁽⁵⁶⁾.

In sum, Kuryłowicz' system is based on the combination of words into complexes characterized by one metrically significant accent (*dominus*), though having secondary ones which are metrically irrelevant.

Method

First, Kuryłowicz does not group word-complexes together on the basis of semantic parallelism but rather uses grammatical criteria.

Second, he notes that Hebrew is endowed with an internal indication of the border of word-complexes, namely spirantization⁽⁵⁷⁾. Based on studies in the first and second books of Psalms, Kuryłowicz discovered that initial stops, when preceded by a word which ends in a vowel, are spirantized within metrical complexes, but that at the junctures of such complexes, there is no spirantization. Thus, Kuryłowicz concludes that this articulation provides an efficient way to isolate word-complexes.

Third, both Kuryłowicz and Cooper list ways in which words may combine to form word-complexes which are subsumed under one accent. Of course, proclitics and conjunctions have no independent metrical accent, and Kuryłowicz accordingly calls them "unaccented prefixes"⁽⁵⁸⁾. Furthermore, nouns in a construct relationship share a single metrical accent⁽⁵⁹⁾. A third category which shares one metrical accent are those words which are connected with a Masoretic *maqgef*. Lastly, when two morphemes co-exist in a close syntactical relationship, they bear one major accent⁽⁶⁰⁾.

According to both Kuryłowicz⁽⁶¹⁾ and Cooper⁽⁶²⁾, the metrical stress of such complexes rests on the last member of the group⁽⁶³⁾.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ J. KURYŁOWICZ, *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics*, 175.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Called "lenition" by Kuryłowicz.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ J. KURYŁOWICZ, *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics*, 172.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ A. COOPER, "Biblical Poetics", 33.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ This would include complexes such as the following: Subject (S) and Verb (V); V + S; V + Direct Object (DO), etc.

⁽⁶¹⁾ J. KURYŁOWICZ, *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics*, 172.

⁽⁶²⁾ A. COOPER, "Biblical Poetics", 33.

⁽⁶³⁾ (X + \acute{V}); (DO + \acute{V}), etc. are a few examples.

Advantages

Like those who adopt syllable counting, the proponents of the syntactic-accentual approach to Hebrew meter feel that their system has certain advantages over previous metrical theories. In contrast to the syllable counting method, Kuryłowicz' approach requires neither the reconstruction nor the revocalization of the text. This is a distinct advantage because the reconstruction of the text involves many difficulties about which scholars are very uncertain. Also, as has been mentioned, any metric theory which builds its case on an emended text is dubious from the start. Moreover, Cooper claims⁽⁶⁴⁾ that Kuryłowicz' method yields consistent results. He believes that its application to Hebrew poetry will result in demonstrating that many parts of a poem which in the past have been treated as metrically imbalanced are actually not.

Method of Analysis

As mentioned, two poems from different time periods have been chosen for analysis, using both the syllable counting and the syntactic-accentual methods. For practical reasons, only one part of Deut 33 and Jer 12 will be presented here.

There is a difference between Cross and Stuart, on the one hand, and Freedman, Cooper⁽⁶⁵⁾ and Kuryłowicz, on the other, concerning the type of text upon which they apply their different approaches⁽⁶⁶⁾. The latter use the unemended MT, whereas the former reconstruct the text. For this reason, on the following pages, both the MT and a reconstructed text are presented in transliteration.

The reconstructed text needs a word of explanation. Cross and Stuart believe that the correct meter of a poem can only be demonstrated on the basis of the poem as it was originally composed. This means that before analysing a poem, it must be restored to its original state. For Stuart, this includes "...textual revision, revocal-

⁽⁶⁴⁾ A. COOPER, "Biblical Poetics", 34.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ This is true even though COOPER, "Biblical Poetics", 49 n. 59, states that he does not rely on the MT as much as Kuryłowicz.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ This I demonstrated above.

ization, orthographic, paleographic, and other linguistic controls, and the systematic deletion of whatever prosaic material may have been interpolated within the original wording of the poem"⁽⁶⁷⁾. He further lists a series of rules in order to recapture the original text⁽⁶⁸⁾. For the purposes of this critique, though, only those grammatical features of the MT which affect the syllable count are reconstructed⁽⁶⁹⁾.

Also, in reconstructing the text, all the poems, regardless of date, are treated in the same manner. There are indeed differences, as in the use of *matres lectionis*, but, in the words of Stuart, who examined the eighth century poetry of Amos: "There are no differences between the poetry of this period and the period of the league and early monarchy that are so great as to affect syllable count"⁽⁷⁰⁾.

Syllable counts are given for both the MT and the reconstructed text. Since Stuart treated all of the early poems in the Old Testament, I was compelled to choose one that he had already done. I did not, however, consult Stuart's work on Deut 33 until I had completed my own analysis. Afterwards, the two results were compared,

⁽⁶⁷⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 9.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 26-28.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ The following list are those rules I employ (based on Stuart's rules) to reconstruct the MT:

1. Segolates are treated as monosyllabic.
2. The *patah furtive* is omitted as a secondary insertion.
3. The same is true for *hatefs*, used with gutturals.
4. The conjunction (*waw*) is deleted when it appears at the beginning of a colon (cf. CROSS and FREEDMAN, "The Blessing of Moses", *JBL* 67 [1948] 198 n. 4).
5. The article, the relative (*'ăšer*) and the direct object marker (*'et*) are also deleted as secondary prosaic insertions.
6. Diphthongs were contracted in the North, but preserved in the South until the Exile.
7. "MT *mayim*, *šamayim*, etc. were originally segolates rather than plurals (*maym*, *šamaym* in the South; *mem*, *šamem* in the North)". (STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 26).
8. The construct plural is vocalized - ē.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 198. In his analysis of a late poem, FREEDMAN, "The Structure of Psalm 137", though not certain, feels that the *'et* was in use by that time. My analysis omits the *'et* and if Freedman turns out to be correct, then the syllable count would be slightly modified. The poems, however, still would not display a consistent metrical pattern on the basis of the syllable count.

and in this manner, greater insight was gained into Stuart's own implementation of his rules.

In order to show the results of the syntactic-accentual method, lines are drawn between the word complexes within a colon which Kurylowicz would describe as having one metrical stress. In those cases in which spirantization confirms a metrical unit, a line is written under the letter concerned; in those cases in which spirantization demonstrates the cohesiveness of a word group, a longer line is drawn beneath it. Finally, to the far right, the number of the metrical stresses is given according to the application of Kurylowicz' system. St. means Stuart, R my own result.

Symbols:

begadkefat letter which confirms metrical structure (not spirantized after a word which ends in a vowel).

begadkefat letter which shows that two words are in the same metrical complex (spirantized after a word which ends in a vowel).

Deuteronomy 33

<i>Masoretic Text</i>	<i>Reconstructed Text</i>	
7) wəzōṭ lîhûḏāh wayō'mar		
a) šema' yahwē qôl y'hûḏāh	š'ma' yahwē qôl y'hûḏāh	7a MT 8:8
wə'el-ammô t'bi' ennû	'el-'ammô t'bi'ennû	R 8:7 2:2
		St. 8:8
		St. retains waw at beginning of second colon
b) yāḏāw rāb lô	yādēw (ya)rāb lô	7b MT 4:8
wə'ēzer miššārāw tiyeh	'izr miššārēw tiyeh	R 4/5:6 2:2
		St. 7:7 2
		St. emends
8) ûl'ēwî 'āmar		8) MT 8:9
tummēkā we'urēkā l'e'îš		R 6:9 2:2
h'sîḏekā		St. omits as prose
'šer nissîṭô b'massāh	nissîṭô b'massāh	
.....t'rîbēhû 'al-mê m'rîbāh	t'rîbēhû 'al-mê m'rîbāh	
9) ha'ômēr l'e'ābîw ûl'e'immô		
lōr'e'îtiw		

<i>Masoretic Text</i>	<i>Reconstructed Text</i>		
a) wē'et- 'ehāw lō' hikkîr wē' et-bānāw lō yāḏā	'ehew lō' hikkîr bānēw lō'yāḏā'	9a) MT 7:7 R 5:5	2:2
b) kî šām ^e rû imrāṭekā ûb ^e rîṭekā yinšōrû	kî šām ^e rû 'imrāṭekā b ^e rîṭekā yinšōrû	St. omits as prose 9b) MT 8:8 R 8:7 St. 7:7	2:2
		St. omits kî	
10)			
a) yôrû mišpāṭekā l'ya' aqōb w ^e ṭōrāṭekā l'yiśrā 'ēl	yôrû mišpāṭekā l'ya' qōb tōrāṭekā l'yiśrā 'ēl	10a) MT 10:9 R 9:8 St. 9:9	2:2
b) yāšîmû q ^e ṭōrāḥ b ^e ' appekā w ^e kālîl 'al-mizb ^e hekā	yāšîmû q ^e ṭōrāḥ b ^e ' appekā kālîl 'al-mizb ^e hekā	St. retains waw 10b) MT 10:8 R 10:7 St. 9:9	2:2
		St. retains waw	
11)			
a) bārēk yahwē hêlô ûpō 'al yādāw tiršeh	bārēk yahwē hêlô pō 'al yādēw tiršeh	11a) MT 6:7 R 6:6 St. 6:6	2:2
b) m ^e ḥaš moṭnayim qāmāw ûm ^e šan 'āw min-y ^e qûmûn	m ^e ḥaš moṭnē-mi qāmēw m ^e šan 'ēw min-y ^e qûmûn	11b) MT 7:8 R 7:7 St. 7:7	2:2
12) l ^e binyāmin 'āmar y ^e ḏîḏ yahwē yiškōn labe- ṭaḥ 'ālāw ḥōpēp 'ālāw kol-hayyôm ûbēn k ^e tēpāw šākēn	y ^e ḏîḏ yahwē hiškōn labeṭḥ 'ēlî ḥōpēp 'ālēw kol-yôm bēn k ^e tēpēw šākēn	12) MT 11:7:7 R 8:8:6 St. 8:8:7	2:2:2
		Even though Stuart retains the waw in the third colon, he still does not achieve balance between all three cola.	
13) ûl ^e yōseṭ 'āmar m ^e bōrekeṭ yahwē 'aršô mimmeḡeḏ šāmayim miṭ- ṭāl ûmitt ^e hôm rōbeṣeṭ tāḥat	mimmaḡd šāmē mi ' 'al mitt ^e hôm rōbeṣeṭ tāḥt	13) MT 8:9 R 6:6 St. 6:6	2:2
14) ûmimmeḡeḏ t ^e bû 'ōṭ šāmeš ûmimmeḡeḏ gereš y ^e rāḥîm	mimmagd t ^e bû 'ōṭ šāmš mimmagd garš yariḥ	14) MT 9:9 R 6:6/5 St. 6:6	1:1

<i>Masoretic Text</i>	<i>Reconstructed Text</i>		
15) ûmērō'š harē-qedem ûmimmegeḏ gib'ôt 'ôlām	mimmagd harē-qadm mimmagd gib'ôt 'ôlām	15) MT 7:8 R 6:6 St. 6:6	1:1
16)			
a) ûmimmegeḏ 'ereš ûm'elō- 'āh ûr̥šôn šōk'nî s'new	mimmagd 'ārš ûm'elōāh r̥šôn šōk'nî s'neh	16a) MT 10:8 R 7:7 St. 7:7	1:1
b) <u>tabō</u> ' t̥āh l'rō' š yōsēḅ ûl'qodqōd n'zîr 'eḥḥāw	tihyena l'rō' š yōsēḅ l'qodqōd n'zîr 'eḥḥāw	16b) MT 7:8 R 7:7 St. 7:7	1:1
17)			
a) b'kôr šôrô hāḏār lô w'qarnê r'ēm qarnāw	b'kôr šôr hāḏār lô qarnê r'ēm qarnēw	17a) MT 7:7 R 6:6 St. 6:6	2:2
b) bahēm 'ammîm y'naggah yahḏāw 'ap̥sê-'ereš	bahēm 'ammîm y'naggah yahḏēw 'ap̥sê-'arš	17b) MT 7:6 R 7:5 St. 6:6	2:2
c) w'hēm rib'ḅôt 'eḫrayîm w'hēm 'alpê m'našseh	hēm rib'ḅôt eḫrēm hēm 'alpê m'našseh	Stuart emends 17c) MT 8:7 R 6:6 St. 6:6	2:2
18) w'elizeḅûlun 'amar		18) MT 9:9 R 9:8	2:2
š'maḥ z'ḅûlun b'šē'ṭekā w'yisšākār b' 'ôhālêkā	š'maḥ z'ḅûlun b'šē'ṭekā yisšākār b'ôhālêkā		
19)			
a) 'ammîm har-yiqrā' û šām yizb'ḥû zibḥê-šedeq	'ammîm har yiqrā' û šām yizb'ḥû zibḥê-šidq	19a) MT 6:8 R 6:7 St. 7:7	2:2
b) kî š'pa' yammîm yînāqû ûš'ḫûnê ṭ'mûnê ḥôl	kî šap' yammîm yînāqû š'ḫûnê ṭ'mûnê ḥôl	19b) MT 8:8 R 7:7 St. 7:7	2:1
20) ûl'gād 'amar bārûk marḥîḅ gād k'elābî' šākēn w'ṭaraḅ z'rōa' 'ap-qodqōḏ	k'elābî šākēn ṭaraḅ z'rō' 'ap qodqōḏ	20) MT 5:9 R 5:7 St. 7:7 Stuart emends	2:2
21) wayyar' re' šîṭ lô kî šām ḥelqaṭ m'ḥōqēq sā- pûn wayyētē' ro' šē 'ām šid'qaṭ yahwē 'āsāh ûmišpāṭāw 'im-yisrā ēl			

<i>Masoretic Text</i>	<i>Reconstructed Text</i>		
22) ûl ^e dān 'amar dān gûr 'aryēh y ^e zannēq min-habbāšān	dān gûr 'aryēh y ^e zannēq mibbāšān	22) MT 4:7 R 4:6 St. 6:6 Stuart emends	2:2
23) ûl ^e naṣṭālī 'amar naṣṭālī š ^e ba 'rāšōn ûmālē'... birkat yahwē yām w ^e ḏārôm y ^e rāšāh	naṣṭālī š ^e ba 'rāšōn mālē' birkat yahwē yām w ^e ḏārôm yīraš	23) MT 7:7:7 R 7:6:6/7 St. 6:6:6	2:2:2
24) ûl ^e āšēr 'amar bārūk mibbānīm 'āšēr y ^e hī r ^e šûy 'ehḥāw w ^e ṭōbēl bašemen raglō	bārūk mibbānīm 'āšēr y ^e hī r ^e šûy 'ehḥāw ṭōbel bašamn raglō	24) MT 7:6:8 R 7:6:6 St. 7:6:6 St. admits imbalance	2:2:2
25) barzel ûn ^e ḥōšet min 'ālē- kā ûk ^e yām ^e kā dāb ^e kā	barzel ûneḥōšt min 'ālēkā k ^e yāmēkā dāb ^e 'ekā	25) MT 10:8 R 9:7 St. may be right when he says some- thing has dropped out	2:2
26) 'ên kā 'ēl y ^e šurûn rōkēb šāmayim b ^e 'ezrekā ûb ^e ga' awātō š ^e ḥāqīm	'ên kā 'ēl y ^e šurûn rōkēb šāmē b ^e 'ezrekā b ^e ga' wātō š ^e ḥāqīm	26) MT 6:9:9 R 6:8:7 St. 6:6:6 St. emends	2:2:2
27) a) m ^e 'onāh 'elohē qedem ûmittaḥṭ z ^e rō 'ōṭ 'ôlam	m ^e 'onāh elohē qadm mittaḥṭ z ^e rō 'ōṭ 'ôlam	27a) MT 8:9 R 7:7 St. 7:7	2:2
b) way ^e garreš mippānēkā 'ôyēb wayyo' mer hašmēḏ	y ^e garreš mippānēkā 'ôyēb yō' mer hašmēḏ	27b) MT 10:5 R 9:4 St. 9:9 Stuart emends	2:2
28) a) wayyiškōn yisrā 'ēl beṭaḥ bādāḏ 'ên ya 'aqōb	yiškōn yisrā 'ēl beṭh bādāḏ 'ên ya 'qōb	28a) MT 8:6 R 6:5 St. 6:6 St. emends	2:2
b) 'el-'ereš dāḡān w ^e ṭīrōš 'aṣ-šāmāw ya 'arṣū-ṭāl	'el-'arš dāḡān w ^e ṭīrōš 'aṣ-šāmēw ya 'rōṣū-ṭāl	28b) MT 8:8 R 7:7 St. 7:7	2:2

<i>Masoretic Text</i>	<i>Reconstructed Text</i>		
29)			
a) 'ašrēkā yīsrā' ēl (mī kāmōkā) 'am nōsa' bayahwē	'ašrēkā yīsrā' ēl (mī kāmōkā) 'am nōsa' bayahwē	29a) MT 6:[4]:6 R 6:[4]:7/6 2:[1]:2 St. 6:6	
b) māgēn 'ezrekā wa 'ašer-ḥereb ga 'awātekā	māgēn 'ezrekā ḥirb ga 'wātekā	29b) MT 5:10 2:2 R 5:5 St. 7:7	
c) w'yikkāḥašû 'ōyēbēkā lāk we' attāh 'al-bāmōtēmō tiqrōk	yikkāḥašû 'ōyēbēkā lāk 'attāh 'al bāmōtēmō tiqrōk	St. adds verbs 29c) MT 10:10 R 9:9 2:2 St. 10:10	

Jeremiah 12

3b) hattiqēm kēšō' n l'ṭibḥāh weḥaqdišēm l' yôm ḥaregāh	hattiqēm kēšō' n l'ṭibḥāh haqdišēm l' yôm ḥaregāh	3b) MT 8:9 R 8:8 2:2	
4)			
a) 'ad-māṭāy te'ēbal ḥā'āreš we' ēšebkol-ḥaššādeh yībāš	'ad-māṭāy te'ēbal āreš ēšeb kol-šādeh yībāš	4a) MT 9:9 2:2 R 7:7	
b) mērā' aṭ yōšēbē-bāh sāpēṭāh b'ḥēmōt wā'ōp kī'āmerû lō' yir'eh 'eṭ 'aḥarītēnû	mērā' aṭ yōšēbē-bāh sāpēṭāh b'ḥemoṭ wā'ōp	4b) MT 7:8 1:1 R 7:8	
5)			
a) kī' eṭ-raglīm raštāh wayyal' ūkā we' ēk t'etaḥ'reh 'eṭ -hassû sîm	kī raglīm raštāh wayyal' ūkā 'ēk t'etaḥ'reh sūsîm	5a) MT 10:10 2:2 R 9:7	
b) ūbereš šālôm 'attāh bôtē- aḥ we'ēk ta'ēseh biḡ'ôn hayyardēn	b'ārš šālôm 'attāh bôtēḥ ēk ta'ēsh biḡ'ôn yardēn	5b) MT 11:10 2:2 R 8:7	
6)			
a) kī ḡam-'aḥēkā ūbêt-'ābīkā gam-hēmmāh baḡdû bāk gam-hēmmāh qar'û 'aḥ- rēkā mālē	kī ḡam-'aḥēkā ūbêt-'ābīkā gam-hēmmāh baḡdû bāk gam-hēmmāh qār'û 'aḥrē- kā mālē	6a) MT 10:7:12 R 10:7:11 1:2:2	
b) 'al-ta'men bām kī-yēdabbērû 'ēlēkā tōbôt	'al-ta'men bām kī yēdabbērû ēlēkā tōbôt	6b) MT 5:10 R 4:10 2:2	
7)			
a) 'āzabtī 'eṭ-bêtī nāṭāštī 'eṭ naḥlātī	'āzabtī bêtī nāṭāštī naḥlātī	7a) MT 6:8 R 5:6 2:2	
b) nāṭattī 'eṭ yēdīdūt nāpši ... bēkap' ōyēbēhā	nāṭattī yēdīdūt nāpši bēkap' ōyēbēhā	7b) MT 9:6 R 8:6 2:1	

<i>Masoretic Text</i>	<i>Reconstructed Text</i>	
8)		
a) hāy*ṭāh-lî naḥ*lāṭî	hāy*ṭāh-lî naḥlāṭî	8a) MT 8:6
.....k*’aryēh bayā’ar	k*’aryēh bayā’ar	R 7:6
b) nāṭnāh ‘ālay b*ḳôlāh	nāṭnāh ‘ālay b*ḳôlāh	8b) MT 7:6
‘al-kēn š’nē’ tîhā	‘al-kēn š’nē’ tîhā	R 7:6
9)		
a) ha’ ayiṭ šābūa’ naḥ*lāṭî lî		
ha’ ayiṭ sabōb ‘alēhā		
b) lēkū ‘ispû kol-ḥayyaṭ haš-šādeh	lekū ‘ispû kol-ḥayyaṭ	9b) MT 10:7
hetāyû lē’okēlāh	hetāyû lē’okēlāh	R 9:7

Critique

The Syllable Count Approach

Theoretically, syllable counting is a valid method of determining the metric structure of a poem. According to J.C. la Drière, the syllable is the basic rhythmic unit in all languages, being the product of a single chest pulse. When the syllables of a poem are ‘isochronous’⁽⁷¹⁾, then syllable counting is an appropriate approach to meter. As a matter of fact, the meter of the poetry of two modern languages, Japanese and French, is based on syllable counting⁽⁷²⁾.

But the relevant question is whether or not *Hebrew* poetry is best approached in the way of Cross, Freedman and Stuart. As a result of the analysis of the above two poems and by other considerations, the answer is negative.

In the first place, there are problems inherent in reconstructing the text *per se*. Cross and Stuart radically reconstruct the text in an attempt to restore the poems’ original vocalization. The reconstruction involves both consonantal and vocalic changes, as well as outright emendations. The major problem herein is the fact that it is extremely dubious to found a metrical theory upon an emended text.

(71) J. C. LA DRIÈRE, “Prosody”, in A. PREMINGER (ed.), *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1974) 674.

(72) Unfortunately, the proponents of the syllable counting method have not pointed this out or made comparisons between these contemporary syllable counting poetic traditions and their theories about ancient Hebrew poetry.

A glance at Stuart's scansion of Deut 33 shows that he often achieves metrical balance between cola by emendation, even without versional support (cf. vv. 7b.14.17b.19a.20a.26.27b.28a). It is only too easy to prove a metrical theory when recourse is taken to textual emendation of this sort. In other words, the researcher makes the text fit his theory. Apart from the emendation of the text, the restoration of the "original" consonantal and vocalic form of the text also presents many difficulties. In brief, little is known about the state of Hebrew grammar in the time when the Old Testament was composed. This is one of the major reasons why some syllable counters⁽⁷³⁾ prefer an unreconstructed MT. Furthermore, even if one accepts Stuart's rules of textual reconstruction, it immediately becomes obvious that the rules leave him free to achieve numerical equality between cola. For example, Stuart states that the ending of the feminine singular noun could be either *-tu (one syllable) or *-atu (two syllables)⁽⁷⁴⁾. In addition, he posits that "alternate forms of constructs, suffixes, prepositions, etc. were varied in the poems *metri causa*..."⁽⁷⁵⁾. With such flexibility, great advantage is given to the proponents of syllable counting.

Another problem inherent in the syllable counting school is the inconsistent application of the rules, in order to achieve what they consider to be a structured metrical pattern. The best example is to consider the way that Stuart treats the conjunction at the beginning of a colon. As early as 1948, Cross and Freedman demonstrated that a *waw* at the beginning of a poetic line is a later prosaic insertion and is better omitted from a poem; Stuart concurs⁽⁷⁶⁾. He betrays, however, much inconsistency concerning which conjunctions he deletes and which he retains. For example, in Deut 33,16a Stuart omits the *waw* before the second colon, in order to achieve a balanced bicolon. In verses 17a, 18, etc., though, he retains the *waw* in order to balance the lines. Moreover, Stuart treats the conjunction *kî* in an equally inconsistent manner. Of the two occurrences of *kî*

⁽⁷³⁾ Note especially D. N. Freedman and R. C. Culley.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ I do not deny the possibility that there could have been two alternate forms for the ending of feminine singular nouns. I am merely pointing out that such rules as this one allows the syllable counter great flexibility in order to achieve syllabic equality.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 27-28.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*, 88 n. 4.

in Deut 33, Stuart retains it once (19a) and omits it the other time (9c). Due to the fact that he does not give a note in order to explain his reasoning, the reader is left with the impression that his motives for retaining or deleting these adjectives were purely metrical. In conclusion, it is clearly dangerous to found a metrical theory upon an emended-restored text, and unfortunately, this is precisely the pitfall in which the Cross-Stuart approach to meter falls. It has taken the text and made it fit their theory.

In the second place, the results of the analysis of Deut 33 and Jer 12 show that the method of counting syllables does not yield consistent results. When unwarranted emendations and inconsistently applied rules of textual restoration are laid aside, the number of syllables in a poem do not betray any kind of metrical pattern. It should also be noted that, even on the basis of Stuart's count, there is poetical imbalance⁽⁷⁷⁾. On the basis of a less free restoration of the MT, however, the unbalanced cola are in the majority. In Deut 33, of 37 bicola and tricola, only 16 are balanced, while 21 are unbalanced (9 lacking only one syllable). Jer 12 shows greatest imbalance with only three bicola which balanced and twenty-three which do not (eight lacking a single syllable)⁽⁷⁸⁾. In sum, the conclusion of this syllable count is that the Hebrew poet was concerned neither consciously nor unconsciously with achieving equality of cola in terms of the number of syllables.

Lastly, even granting the counts of Stuart, Freedman and others, do they really show the *metrical* pattern of the poem? The patterns of the poems analyzed here are not 'metrical' at all. Research into poetic theory shows that the patterns demonstrated by Stuart and Freedman⁽⁷⁹⁾ lack one major ingredient which would constitute the pattern as meter, *repetitiveness*. Paul Fussell, Jr., for example, has stated that the main difference between rhythm and meter is regularity and predictability. In his words: "Meter is what results when the rhythmical movements of colloquial speech are heightened, organized, and regulated so that pattern emerges from the relative hap-

⁽⁷⁷⁾ Note, for example, Stuart's count for Deut 33,12.24.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Notice, however, that the poems with the highest degree of parallelism have a stronger tendency toward having an equal number of syllables.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Stuart and Freedman, however, end up with completely different types of "patterns" for the poems which they analyse. While Stuart's counts yield isosyllabic bi- and tricola, Freedman's do not.

hazard of ordinary utterance”⁽⁸⁰⁾. All speech (prose and poetry) is characterized by rhythm, and according to J.C. la Drière:

The rhythm of speech is a structure of ordered variation in the quantitative aspects of the flow of sound in which contrast is balanced by a cyclic recurrence of some identity. Meter is a fixed schematization of the cyclically recurring identity in a rhythmical series⁽⁸¹⁾.

Or, as he states elsewhere:

Metrical rhythm is distinguished from that of prose by having as the unit of cyclic recurrence not the group-entity but an entity constituted ‘artificially’ by abstraction and recombination of prosodic components of the group in some fixed scheme⁽⁸²⁾.

These quotations serve to postulate that a *metrical* pattern is characterized by a repetitive and fixed schematization of the rhythm. The question which now must be asked is whether or not the patterns presented by Stuart and the others fit such a description. The answer is decidedly negative. While Stuart shows that cola within bi- or tricola have the same number of syllables, there is no wider pattern which fits the whole poem. For instance, Stuart’s ‘pattern’ for the fifth part of Judg 5 (vv. 28-30) is 10:10 :: 4:4 :: 4:4 :: 9:9 :: 5:6 :: 4:4 :: 7:7:7; it thus shows no repetitiveness⁽⁸³⁾. Similarly, while Freedman does not attempt to show that parallel cola are equal in terms of syllable count, one would be hard pressed to call his results “repetitive” or “predictable”⁽⁸⁴⁾. Finally, most of the proponents of the syllable counting approach to Hebrew meter also argue that the poems were orally composed and then handed down. The use of formulas, a sign of oral composition, also betrays the presence of a metrical schema according to Cross and Stuart (follow-

⁽⁸⁰⁾ P. FUSSEL, JR., “Meter”, in *Princeton Encyclopedia*, 496-497.

⁽⁸¹⁾ J. C. LA DRIÈRE, “Prosody”, 670.

⁽⁸²⁾ J. C. LA DRIÈRE, “Prosody”, 676.

⁽⁸³⁾ As a second example, here is Stuart’s syllable count for the second Balaam oracle (p. 111) 8:8::7:7::8:8::7:7::8:8::7:7::7:7::6:6::8:8::7:7::7:7.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Freedman seeks to show that large units like stanzas in a poem have a similar number of syllables, not that cola within bicolon are isosyllabic. For one example of many, see FREEDMAN and HYLAND, “Psalm 29”, 239-240.

ing Parry and Lord). The meter's function was to facilitate the composition of the poem which occurred at each recitation. Yet, with the patterns which Stuart uncovers, it is extremely difficult to imagine how this helped the bard in his composition.

In spite of these serious reservations raised about the effectiveness of syllable counting as an accurate guide to the metrical structure of a Hebrew poem, the method does provide insights into the stylistic structure of the poem⁽⁸⁵⁾. The *tendency* toward an equal number of syllables between cola in Hebrew poetry may be the result of parallelism; the fact that one colon repeats the thought of another means that the number of syllables in each colon would be approximately equal. Parallelism may also explain the fact that in the analysis above there was a higher proportion of balanced cola in those poems which are characterized by strong parallelism (Deut 33) than in the one which was not (Jer 12).

Syntactic-Accentual Approach

To date, very little has been written about the syntactic-accentual approach to Hebrew meter. Also, few poems have been subjected to analysis on the basis of this approach. Only two complete poems, in fact, Ps 44⁽⁸⁶⁾ and Prov 8,22-31⁽⁸⁷⁾, have been treated thus far. This in itself provides great difficulties in the implementation and analysis of the method.

The first unanswered question is what exactly constitutes a word complex which carries the metrical stress. To be sure, both Cooper⁽⁸⁸⁾ and Kuryłowicz⁽⁸⁹⁾ give general rules, but they do not always help to solve the problem. For example, if a line is composed of a subject (S) and a verb (V), followed by an object (O), is the line to be regarded as (S + \acute{V}) + \acute{O} or \acute{S} + (V + \acute{O}). While, in either case, the

(85) If this is all Freedman is saying by means of counting syllables, which is the impression one gets from reading O'Connor's interpretation of his method, then the only criticism which can legitimately be raised against him is one of unclarity. See footnote 36.

(86) J. KURYŁOWICZ, *Metrik und Sprachgeschichte*, 222.

(87) A. COOPER, "Biblical Poetics", 112-139.

(88) A. COOPER, "Biblical Poetics", 120ff.

(89) J. KURYŁOWICZ, *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics*, 172ff.

line has two stresses, there is some ambiguity over the exact metrical analysis of a line like Deut 33,22:

dān gūr 'aryēh yzannēq min-habbāšān

Is it \acute{S} + (compound predicate) // \acute{V} + (Prep. Phrase) with a 2/2 metrical pattern or (S + compound predicate) // (V + Prep. Phrase) with a 1/1 pattern? The method as elucidated by Cooper and Kuryłowicz does not allow us to decide.

Another problem is that the (non) spirantization of the *begad-kefat* letters after a vowel at the metrical juncture of word complexes does not occur often enough to be an extremely valuable analytic tool. While it does occur with some regularity in Jer 12, it occurs rarely in Deut 33.

Finally, in the two poems analyzed, the resultant patterns, while considerably more balanced than by the syllable counting method, still showed some anomalies. The overall pattern of Deut 33 was comprised of 2:2 couplets with a series of 1:1 couplets in the middle of the poem. While this provides a nicely patterned structure, verse 4 is metrically inconsistent. On the other hand, Jer 12 showed more frequent deviations from a basic 2:2 pattern.

Conclusion

Two contemporary approaches to Hebrew meter have been presented in order to examine their respective effectiveness in analysing the metrical structure of Old Testament poems. Unfortunately, neither case yields unequivocally positive results. In terms of syllable counting, questions have been raised of both a theoretical and practical nature which lead me to doubt that its widespread application will help clarify metrical structure. Much scepticism also looms over the syntactical-accentual approach.

Contemporary metrists apparently have not advanced any further than their predecessors in solving the puzzle of Hebrew meter. One may question the validity of the metrical quest as did Douglas Young in an excellent article written in 1950⁽⁹⁰⁾. This article, entitled "Ugaritic Prosody", laid a strong case against the existence of meter in Ugaritic and Hebrew.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ G. D. YOUNG, "Ugaritic Prosody".

If Hebrew poetry was not structured by meter, what gave it its form? Many would reply "parallelism", but if they mean semantic or thought-parallelism, then they would be hard pressed to show how it operates as a structural device in a poem like Jer 12⁽⁹¹⁾.

In conclusion, brief mention will be made of a possible alternative to meter and semantic parallelism; that is grammatical or syntactical parallelism. Syntactical parallelism has indeed been mentioned in the classical studies on parallelism, but it has not been applied in a developed way. Terrence Collins⁽⁹²⁾, however, has successfully applied a sophisticated version of syntactical parallelism to the poetry of the prophets. The same approach will likely work with the Psalms as well.

Thus, while concluding rather negatively concerning the possibility of discovering a metrical structure to the Old Testament, perhaps syntactical parallelism is the best way to understand the structure of the Hebrew poems⁽⁹³⁾.

Westminster Theological Seminary
P.O. Box 27009
Philadelphia, PA 19118

Tremper LONGMAN III

SOMMAIRE

Les deux approches de la versification hébraïque, le comptage des syllabes et la méthode «syntactico-accentuelle», sont analysées du point de vue théorique et pratique. Le comptage des syllabes est jugé inapproprié à cause 1) des problèmes textuels; 2) de l'inconsistance dans l'application des règles; 3) de l'impossibilité de scander Dt 33 et Jer 12; 4) du regrettable manque de régularité et de prévisibilité du modèle «métrique». L'approche «syntactico-accentuelle» est rejetée à cause 1) de l'ambiguïté de la méthode; 2) de l'impossibilité de scander Dt 33 et Jer 12.

⁽⁹¹⁾ Unless, of course, one accepts a broad definition of "synthetic" parallelism which operates as a kind of grab-bag for all non-synonymous and non-antithetic lines.

⁽⁹²⁾ T. COLLINS, *Line-forms in Hebrew Poetry* (Rome 1978).

⁽⁹³⁾ J. KUGEL'S *The Idea of Biblical Poetry* (New Haven 1981) has been published recently and presents the provocative thesis that the prose-poetry distinction is wrong-minded. If he is right (and his case is well made), the whole enterprise of searching for the "key" which distinguishes prose from poetry is invalid.

ANIMADVERSIONES

The Metaphor in Job 10,17

This note attempts to determine the meaning of a difficult strophe in the Book of Job by applying the principle of congruity of metaphor⁽¹⁾ and by comparison with extra-biblical passages⁽²⁾. The text in question, Job 10,17, has provoked a variety of explanations and since they have been surveyed recently by Grabbe⁽³⁾ there is no need for more than summary reference here. The Hebrew text runs:

- (a) *thdš 'dyk ngdy*
- (b) *wtrb k'sk 'mdy*
- (c) *hlypwt wšb' 'my*

The main obstacle to intelligibility is the second word in line (a), '*dyk*. Traditionally it is taken to mean "witnesses" (so MT and ancient versions, including LXX, Aq., Theod., Vg. and the Targums)⁽⁴⁾ even though semantic parallelism with either line (b) or line (c) would then be totally lacking. An alternative is to assign the word a meaning related to combat (so Symm., Syr.) and many scholars prefer this solution. Yet another possibility, first proposed by Dahood⁽⁵⁾, is to compare Ugaritic *gd*, "to swell", and translate "vexation" or the like, but there are objections to such a view⁽⁶⁾. Ultimately, the problem is not one of parallelism, but of *metaphor* and the solution lies not in pitting versional evidence against modern philological proposals (based on ancient languages) but in determining which metaphor the poet is using here. If the underlying figure is forensic, then '*dyk* means "your witnesses". If, on the other hand, these lines speak of combat, as the context in

(1) M. J. DAHOOD, "Congruity of Metaphors", *VTS* 16 (Leiden 1967) 40-49.

(2) I am grateful to Professor B. Margalit of Haifa for his detailed critique of a previous draft. The views expressed here, of course, are my own.

(3) L. L. GRABBE, *Comparative Philology and the Text of Job: A Study in Methodology* (Missoula 1977) 63-66.

(4) The versional evidence is surveyed by GRABBE, *Comparative Philology*, 63. He points out, too, that form criticism favours the meaning "witness" (p. 65) but this can be countered by arguments mustered in the present note.

(5) M. J. DAHOOD, *Psalms I*, 197, followed by A. C. M. BLOMMERDE, *North-west Semitic Grammar and Job* (BiOr 22; Rome 1969) 60.

(6) See GRABBE, *Comparative Philology*, 64, who argues that the Arabic cognate primarily concerns glandular swelling and that in any case this word is poorly attested (if at all) elsewhere in Ugaritic.

v. 16 seems to indicate, then this particular word must have an appropriate meaning.

The expression *ḥalipôt wəšābā* is a key component in our text: if we can pinpoint its meaning we can decide on the nature of the metaphor here. A pointer in the right direction is provided by a neo-Babylonian text which uses almost identical terms: *ḥantiš lūḥalpi šuprānu šābē pitinūtu lūkidinniya u nēpišu*, "Quickly, do send replacements, strong men, troops under my protection and equipment" (7). Not only does this indicate a military meaning for the Hebrew expression; it also suggests hendiadys (8). Accordingly "fresh troops" is correct, as several commentators have long assumed (9).

The metaphor in Job 10,17, therefore, is probably military in character: God is depicted as a general sending out successive waves of troops against his enemy, Job. If such is the case, then *'dyk* must also denote "troops". A much-discussed passage in Ugaritic also suggests as much, though unfortunately scholars do not agree on its meaning. It is CTA 14 ii 85-87 / UT Krt 85-87 (repeated verbatim in 176-78) (10):

'dn ngb wyši
šbu šbi ngb
wyši 'dn m'

The assembled *troop* must sally out
– the vast assembled army –
sally out must the combined *forces*.

Here, too, the root and meaning of *'dn* are a matter of dispute. If *-n* is an affirmative, any of the following Arabic roots (and their derivatives) may be cognate: *'adā* (*'dw*), "to run, speed, gallop; engage in hostile action"; *'adda*, "to count, number", hence *'idda*, "numerous army"; *'dy*, "to pass by", hence "seasonal labourers" (11). If the final consonant is part of the root, then the cognate would be *'adanatu*, "company of men, multitude" (from *'dn*, "to remain, stay" (12). The strophe in Ugaritic and the verse from Job share many common features, notably the common semantic field 'army'

(7) A. T. CLAY, *Yale Oriental Studies* 3, 188: 8-10, cited in *CAD*, H, 49. See also *AHW* 313a.

(8) So already M. H. POPE, *Job*, 79, though he opts for the forensic interpretation. On hendiadys cf. G. T. WRIGHT, *PMLA* 96 (1981) 169-93.

(9) For discussion of *ḥlp* / *ḥlp* in Hebrew, Ugaritic, Akkadian (and Aramaic) see the survey by O. LORETZ, *Die Psalmen. Teil II* (AOAT 207/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1979) 417-419.

(10) Discussed recently by me in *Or* 48 (1979) 112-127 and by F. C. FENSHAM, "Notes on Keret 79(b)-89 (CTA 14: 79(b)-89)", *JNSL* 7 (1979) 17-25. With most scholars I now take *ngb* as a passive form of *gbb* (N: "to be gathered") following A. HERDNER, *Syria* 23 (1942) 278.

(11) The solution mentioned last is by FENSHAM, *JNSL* 7 (1979) 21-23, and is novel if unconvincing. He equates *'dn* with the same word used in non-literary Ugaritic texts to denote seasonal labourers on a lower social scale than *bnšm* – as proposed by M. DIETRICH, O. LORETZ, J. SANMARTÍN, *UF* 6 (1974) 33 – the root being *'dy*, "to pass by".

(12) For a convenient list of opinions cf. J. GRAY, *The Krt Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra* (Leiden 1964) 39.

which already suggests a meaning for 'dn / 'dy(k). Of particular significance is the compound word-pair in the Keret text: 'dn // šbu šbi of the first two lines and šbu šbi // 'dn of lines two and three. It is arguable that a corresponding parallel pair is used in the Hebrew passage ('dyk // šb') and that the meaning of the first element is "your troops", parallel to "army". The Arabic cognate would be 'dw, "to engage in hostile action" (see above) and the final letter of Ug. 'dn, also "troops", an affirmative. Accordingly, Job 10,17 can be rendered:

You renew your combatants opposite me,
 - and increase your irritation with me -
 with relief-troops against me.

Hebrew Department
 Trinity College
 Dublin 2, Ireland

Wilfred G. E. WATSON

The Dative Suffix in Job 33,13

To elicit sense from the second colon of Job 33,13 even the conservative *Revised Standard Version* is obliged to resort to consonantal emendation⁽¹⁾, altering MT *dēbārāyw*, "his words", to *dēbārāy*, "my words", and inserting "saying", so as to render the verse, "Why do you contend against me, saying, 'He will answer none of my words'?" Another solution would simply reprint MT *dēbārāyw*, "his words", to qal participle *dōbērāyw* and parse the suffix as dative. Hence read and translate:

maddūa' 'ēlāyw rībôtā
kī kol-dōbērāyw lō'-ya'āneh
 Why do you complain to Him,
 that He answers none who speak to Him?⁽²⁾

In his commentary of 1903 on Phoenician Eshmunazor, line 6, 'p'm 'dmm ydbrnk, which he translated, "Yea, if men speak to thee", G. A. Cook⁽³⁾ called attention to the dative suffix in Gen 37,4, *wēlō' yāk'lū dabbērō lēšālôm*, "And they could not speak to him peaceably". In both *BHK*³ and *BHS* the respective editors propose to emend *dabbērō* in Gen 37,4 to (*l*) *dabbēr lō* on the basis of LXX λαλεῖν αὐτῷ thus revealing their innocence of the dative function of suffixes. In Ugaritic too, suffixes with dative force are quite frequent⁽⁴⁾, especially with verbs of speaking, such as *argmk*, "I speak to you" (*UT*, 51 I 21).

⁽¹⁾ The latest English translation, the *New International Version* (Grand Rapids 1978), renders the second colon, "that he answers none of man's words", with the note "Or that he does not answer for any of his actions".

⁽²⁾ The emphatic negative construction of the second colon *kol-dōbērāyw lō' ya'āneh*, literally, "that all who speak to Him He does not answer", compares with that of Job 34,27, *wēkol-dērākāyw lō' hiškîlū*, "and they heeded none of his ways", and with the structure of Prov 6,35, *lō' yîššā' pānēy* (MT *pēnēy*) *kol kōper*, "No payment whatever will placate him". Cf. also Jer 51,43 and Ezek 28,3.

⁽³⁾ *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford 1903) 35.

⁽⁴⁾ Consult C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook*, § 6.21, p. 39; M. BOGAERT, «Les suffixes verbaux non accusatifs dans le sémitique nord-occidental et particulièrement en hébreu», *Bib* 45 (1964) 220-247, esp. 229, 239. In *VT* 29 (1979) 425, T. MURAOKA has correctly observed, "In an article published in 1964, M. Bogaert demonstrated that, *pace* most modern authorities, Hebrew along with some other Northwest Semitic languages, possesses a considerable number of verbs to which a non-accusative pronoun can be directly attached". The emendation proposed in *BHK*³ and *BHS* sustains Muraoka's statement about «most modern authorities».

The poetic balance between the prepositional phrase 'ēlāyw, "to Him", and the dative suffix of dōb*erāyw, "who speak to Him", may be considered a characteristic of Job since it recurs in 3,25; 6,4; 15,17; 20,22; 29,16; 30,9; 32,14; 33,5.33; 40,30; 41,20-21⁽⁵⁾. Occurring in vv. 5 and 33, this would be the third instance of this stylistic phenomenon in our chapter.

The proposed reading dōb*erāyw and the resultant new translation fit the context admirably, because in the next three verses Elihu proceeds to confute Job's complaint by describing in detail the ways in which God does speak to men: "For God does speak in one way, and in two ways does the Omnipotent⁽⁶⁾ appear, in a dream, a vision of the night, etc".

† Mitchell DAHOOD

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. A. R. CERESKO, *Job 29-31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic* (BiOr 36; Rome 1980) 21, 220.

⁽⁶⁾ Repointing MT lō' to lē', "the Omnipotent", to recover the balance with first-colon 'ēl, with which it forms a composite divine title. On the divine epithet lē', see L. VIGANÒ, *Nomi e titoli di YHWH alla luce del semitico del Nord-ovest* (BiOr 31; Roma 1976) 80-106, esp. 98-99.

An Ebla Personal Name and the Metaphor in Psalm 19,11-12

In these verses the most serious dispute centers perhaps on the derivation of *nizhār* in vs. 12. Ps 19,11a and 12 read:

<i>hanneḥēmādīm mizzāhāb</i>	More desirable than gold,
<i>ūmippaz rāb. . .</i>	and much fine gold. . .
<i>gam-'abdēkā nizhār bāhem</i>	Indeed your servant is enlightened by them;
<i>b'šomrām 'ēqeb rāb</i>	in observing them there is a great re- ward.

The subjects of this comparison are *mišpēṭē-yhwh*, "the judgments of Yahweh", in vs.10b which the psalmist finds more desirable than gold, sweeter than honey, and by which he is *nizhār*. Should the root of *nizhār* be ascribed to *zhr* I, "to be light, shining", or to *zhr* II, "to admonish, warn"? The latest full-scale Hebrew lexicon, that of W. Baumgartner⁽¹⁾, subsumes it under *zhr* II, "sich warnen lassen" in the niphal, and the most recent English translation follows suit, "By them is your servant warned" (*New International Version*)⁽²⁾.

In 1966 I translated *nizhār* "is enlightened" with the following comment: "Instead of rendering it 'is warned' with most moderns, the *Bible de la Pléiade* (ed. É. Dhorme), II, p. 927, retains the root meaning of *zhr*, 'éclairer', on the basis of Dan xii 3. The consideration that *zhr* may also be predicated of the sun supports the *Pléiade* translation; to describe the Law, the psalmist, it has been noted, chose terms that are properly predicable of the sun"⁽³⁾.

This line of reasoning can now appeal to the fascinating personal name from Ebla, *sa-ab-za-ir-ma-lik/zahab-zāhir-malik*/ "Shining gold is Malik" (*MEE* 2,3 rev. VI 12)⁽⁴⁾. Thus the root *zhr* could be predicated not only of

⁽¹⁾ *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* I (Leiden 1967) 254-255.

⁽²⁾ Grand Rapids 1978. However, the recent *Nueva Biblia Española* of L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL and J. MATEOS (Madrid 1975) 1173, correctly relates *nizhār* to *zhr* I, "Pero, aunque iluminan a tu siervo", but needlessly alters the passive construction of the Hebrew to the active in Spanish.

⁽³⁾ *Psalms* I (AB 16; Garden City, N.Y.) 124.

⁽⁴⁾ *MEE* 2 equals G. PETTINATO, *Testi amministrativi della biblioteca* L. 2769 (*Materiali epigrafici di Ebla* 2; Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, 1980). *MEE* 1, cited further on, is G. PETTINATO, *Catalogo dei testi cuneiformi di Tell Mardikh-Ebla* (Napoli 1979).

the sun (Dan 12,3) but also of *zāhāb*, "gold". Since the first two terms of this name are mutually defining, this interpretation carries conviction⁽⁵⁾. The Eblaite personal name juxtaposes the two roots that concur in *zāhāb* and *nizhār* of the psalm passage. The psalmist also employs here the poetic word *pāz*, "fine gold", hitherto witnessed only in Hebrew and Ugaritic *pā*, which probably appears in the Ebla toponym *gū-ba-zū^{kl}/gū-pazu/* "The Voice is fine gold" (*MEE* 2,41 obv. IV 4). Ugaritic *g*, "voice", permits this rendition of the first component of *gūpazu*.

At first blush *zahab-zāhir-malik*, "Shining gold is Malik", looks improbable as the interpretation of a name until one calls to mind the name of Job's friend 'ēlīpāz, "My God is fine gold" (Job 22,1)⁽⁶⁾. In their commentary on Job 22,25, "Then will the Almighty be thy gold-ore", S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray shrewdly observe, "Possibly Eliphaz speaks with a recollection of the meaning of his own name: Job will have the same enjoyment of God as Eliphaz has"⁽⁷⁾. The Ugar. PN *aktmy* (*UT*, 321 IV 10) may now be understood as "I consider Ya pure gold", a denominative verb from *ktm*, "pure gold"; cf. Job 31,24.

Of course, some will object that the chronological chasm forecloses the possible relevance of third-millennium texts to the understanding of a first-millennium psalm. In decades past one heard similar objections raised against late second-millennium Ugaritic tablets as possibly pertinent to biblical research, but such voices are generally muted today thanks to the consistent contribution made by comparative Ugaritic-Hebrew studies on various levels in recent years⁽⁸⁾.

The personal name cited above is not the only instance of what may be called "mutual elucidation". In his recent examination of the PN *iš_x-gi-ba-ir* in TM.75.G.1430 obv. IV 2, P. Fronzaroli⁽⁹⁾ correctly identified the verb *šg*, "to increase", so as to render the name "possa egli crescere o ND!" But he appears less dexterous in his handling of the divine component *ba-ir*,

⁽⁵⁾ Here spelled *sa-ab*, the word for "gold" is written *za-ab* in the toponym *da-gār-za-ab^{kl}/taggār-zahab/* "Gold-mart" (*MEE* 2,27 rev. V 9). Though *hry*, "gold" recurs some 50 times in Ugaritic (see R. WHITAKER'S *Concordance*) *zāhāb* (*ḏhb*) has yet to crop up in the Ras Shamra texts. On the other hand, *zāhāb* is the common word for "gold" in Hebrew with *hārūš* limited to eight (including two in Ben Sira) poetic texts. This appears to be a significant lexical isogloss distinguishing Eblaite and Hebrew from Ugaritic.

⁽⁶⁾ Eliphaz is also the name of one of Esau's sons according to Gen 36,4ff.

⁽⁷⁾ *The Book of Job* (ICC; Edinburgh 1921) I, 198.

⁽⁸⁾ Consult the balanced evaluation by É. JACOB, "Ugarit dans les études vérotestamentaires. Bilan d'un demi-siècle", *UF* 11 (1979) 395-406.

⁽⁹⁾ *Studi eblaiti* III/5-8, 1980, 73. But I am nonplussed by the second part of his statement, "Il verbo *šg' 'crescere' è attestato in aramaico, da cui è passato anche in fenicio e in ebraico", which he documents by a reference to M. WAGNER'S 1966 study on Aramaisms in the OT. Fronzaroli seems unaware that the *status quaestionis* has radically shifted as a result of the Ebla finds. If *šg*' shows up in Eblaite, how can one still claim that it entered Phoenician and Hebrew via Aramaic? Isn't it more likely that its presence in Phoenician and Hebrew is due to Early Canaanite? An updating of Wagner's *Aramaismen* in the light of Ebla becomes a desideratum.

which he normalizes *bā'ir* and derives from *b'r*, "to capture (with the net)", known only in Akkadian and modern South Arabian languages. Hence the image of a god who captures foes with his net.

The Canaanite approach would turn to Job 37,21 for possible light on the divine element *ba-ir*. Job 37,21 reads, *w'attāh lō' rā'ū 'ôr / bāhîr hū' baššēhāqîm*, "Even now they don't see the Light / the Brilliant One is He in the skies". These cola have lent themselves to varying versions, but they acquire coherence when both '*ôr*, "Light" ⁽¹⁰⁾, and the hapax *bāhîr*, "the Brilliant One", are seen to designate God, who in vs. 23, is called *šaggî'-kōah*, "Exalted in Power". Which is to say that *bāhîr* and *šaggî'* reflect the same two roots witnessed in the Ebla PN *iš_x-gi-ba-ir/yiṣgi'-bāhîr* / "The Brilliant One is exalted". Cf. also *iš_x-gi-da-ar/yiṣgi'-dār* / "The Everlasting is exalted" (MEE 2,6 obv. II 5).

Or again, the Ebla PN *a-du-ul-li-im* (MEE 2,32 obv. II 17) becomes intelligible when compared with 1 Sam 2,5, *šbē'im ballehem niškāru / ūr'ē-bîm hādellū 'ad*, recently rendered by P. Kyle McCarter, Jr. ⁽¹¹⁾, "The sated have hired out for bread / while the hungry are fattened on food". Availing himself of the eighteenth-century distinction between *hđl* I, "to cease", and *hđl* II, "to be, become fat", which had got lost but was found again some 50 years ago ⁽¹²⁾, McCarter translates disputed *hādellū 'ad*, "are fattened on food". Thus the concurrence of *lehem*, "bread", and *hādellū* in parallel cola favors the normalization of *a-du-ul-li-im* as *hādūl-lihim*, "Fattened by the Grain God". *Hādūl* parses as the qal passive participle, while *lihim* answers to Hebrew *lehem* signifying both "grain" and "bread". In the Ebla PN *lihim* designates the Canaanite grain god who was worshipped at *bêt-lehem*, "Temple of Grain God", in the Canaanite period.

The preceding are examples of mutually elucidating texts. The following citation illustrates how the Bible can help interpret the Ebla PN *sar-du-du* in MEE 2,21 obv. III 10. Ps 81,7 *hširōtî missēbel šikmō/kappāyw middūd ta'abōrnāh*, "I removed his shoulder from the burden/his hands were freed from the basket", suggests "The basket has passed on" as the meaning of *sār-dūdu*. Giving this name to his son, the father rejoiced in the knowledge that the burdensome basket would now pass to younger hands. When Isaiah named his son *š'ār yāšūb*, "A remnant will return" (Isa 7,3), he doubtless

⁽¹⁰⁾ For another text in which '*ôr* designates God Himself, see Job 24,13, *hēmāh hāyū b'mōrēdē-'ôr lō'-hikkîrū d'rākāyw w'lō' yāšbū binetibōtāyw*, "They are among those who rebel against the Light / they recognize not His ways / nor stay in His paths". Elsewhere in biblical usage *mārad* always means "to rebel against a person"; cf. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS, *Lexicon*, 597b, who cite our passage as the only purported exception.

⁽¹¹⁾ *I Samuel* (AB 8; Garden City, N.Y. 1980) 67.

⁽¹²⁾ See the discussion in *I Samuel*, 72, with bibliography, to which may be added D. N. FREEDMAN-J. LUNDBOM, in G. J. BOTTERWECK and H. RINGGREN (edd.), *TWAT* II (Stuttgart 1977) Cols. 754-756, who argue that *hđl* II can be recognized in some seven biblical passages. I would here direct attention to Prov 23,3-4 where *lehem* and *hādāl* in the same context recall Eblaite/*hādūl-lihim*. The hypocoristic *a-du-ul/hādūl* / "Fattened", recurs in MEE 2, 20 obv. III 1 and 21 obv. IV 1. There is also the toponym *a-du-lu^{KI}* in MEE 1, 6520.

did so with this hope in his heart. In *sār-dūdu* one identifies the qal perfect of *sūr*, heretofore known as an exclusively Hebrew verb, and the noun *dūdu*, used in several Semitic languages.

The Ebla PN *ni-sī-ma-il* in MEE 2,33 obv. IX 8 yields to analysis when compared with Ex 17,15, "Moses built an altar and called it 'Yahweh is my Banner' (*yhwh nissī*)". This comparison prompts the normalization *nissī-ma-'il*, "My Banner indeed is Il", with *-ma-* parsed as the enclitic particle within a personal name. This insertion recurs in MEE 2,7 obv. XI 5, *i-ti-ma-il/'itti-mā-'il/* "With me indeed is Il", and in MEE 1,929 (TM.75.G.1491) *la-ma-il/la-mā-'il/* "Belonging indeed to Il"; the latter sheds light on PN *lēmō'ēl* in Prov 31,4 and its "Phoenician" form *lēmū'ēl* (long *o* becomes long *u* in the Phoenician dialect) in Prov 31,1. The biblical PNN *lā'ēl* "Belonging to El", in Num 3,24 and *lēmō'ēl* are now seen to express the same religious sentiment; the only formal difference is the presence of the enclitic *-mō-* in *lēmō'ēl* (13). Gen 10,28 *'abīmā'ēl* readily translates "My father indeed is El", with *-mā-* parsed as the Canaanite form of the enclitic which did not become Hebrew *-mō-* as in *lēmō'ēl*.

At this early stage of comparative Eblaite-Hebrew research I have felt it necessary to cite several instances of mutually elucidating names and phrases to validate the proposed comparison between the Eblaite PN *sa-ab-za-ir-ma-lik* and Ps 19,11-12 *zāhāb* and *nizhār*. Many scholars might balk at the idea that third-millennium texts from northwestern Syria can impinge on the interpretation of first-millennium records from central Palestine, and considerable skepticism can be expected to greet early efforts made in this direction. But those familiar with the history of Ugaritic-Hebrew studies will take this as a matter of course, sympathize with the skeptics, and proceed to exploit the rich epigraphic data from Tell Mardikh, not only to clarify biblical obscurities but also to elucidate the language of the Ebla tablets through the insights afforded by Ugaritic and Hebrew (14).

† Mitchell DAHOOD

(13) Consult BAUMGARTNER, *Lexikon*, II, 505b.

(14) Thus comparison with Ex 30,5, "Make the handles (*habbaddīm*) of acacia wood and overlay them with gold (*zāhāb*)", renders intelligible MEE 2,20 obv. VIII 6, 1 *gir mar-tu ba-du-u/baddu-hū/ guškin* "one Amorite dagger whose handle is gold". Sumerian *guškin* was probably read *zahab* if the comparison is not misleading. This Eblaite clause in turn sheds light on TM.75.G. 1669 obv. V 8, recently published by A. Archi in *Studi Eblaiti* II / 1, 1980, 12-13, 1 *gir mar-tu ga-me-ù/game'-hū/ ba r̄6:k ù*, "one Amorite dagger whose haft is silver", where Heb. *gōme'*, "reed", an exclusively Northwest Semitic and Egyptian term, facilitates the interpretation of Eblaite *ga-me*. Biblical *baddīm* overlaid with *zāhāb* and Eblaite *baddu-hū guškin* recall UT, 51 I 33, *bdm hrš* in a list of items manufactured by the artisan god *Kīr*, which several scholars have translated as "handles of gold", a construct chain with enclitic *mi* interposed.

Zu Prov 23,1-2

Prov 23,2a steht seit alten Zeiten als eine *crux interpretum* im umgebenden Text und hat Kopfzerbrechen verursacht. Heute bezeichnet man zwei Worte als zweifelhaft (*dubia*), so G. Beer und die Stuttgarter Bibel. Über den Rest des Verses ist man sich im ganzen einig und sagt etwa: 1 "Wenn du mit einem grossen Herrn zu speisen sitzt, so achte wohl auf das, was dir vorgesetzt ist. 2. . . , wenn du Esslust hast". Man mag für 2a etwa erwarten: "Halte an dich" o. ä. Aber MT hat: *wəšamṭā šakkīn bəlo'ekā*. Wie eine nachträgliche Überprüfung der neueren Übersetzungen der Stelle ergab, bemerkt die BJ zu diesen Worten des Hebräischen: "c'est à dire sans doute: mets un frein à ta voracité".

"Und setze ein Messer an deine Kehle" hat die Graeca anscheinend vermieden. Sie knüpft an 1b einen im übrigen plausiblen Rat, doch wohl frei, an, wenn sie sagt: καὶ ἐπιβαλλε τὴν χειρὰ σου εἰδὼς ὅτι τοιαῦτά σε δεῖ παρασκευάσαι. Aber sie behält *wəšamṭā* nach *bīn tābēn* gut als volitiv fest, wie es noch Sa'adyā in seiner arabischen Übersetzung mit *wašayyir sakkīnan fi ḥalqika* tut und vorher die Peschitta mit dem kühnen, aber zu sehr abweichenden *dlā tsīm*. Ebenso, m. E. mit Recht, weithin die Neueren; besonders entschieden im Ausdruck des Volitivs ist NEB: "cut your throat first". Anders das Targum. Es wählt *ūtēsīm* für *wəšamṭā* und gibt damit den Weg zu einer konsekutiven Auffassung frei, für die sich z. B. die französischen Rabbinen (Z. Kahn, *La Bible* [Paris 1899]) u. a. entschieden: "tu t'enfonceras un couteau dans la gorge". Im Syrischen wird man *gabrā danpīš* als Übersetzung von hb. *ba'al nefes* "gierig" ebenso wie dieses zu verstehen haben, also *avidus*, nicht *animatus*, wie Brockelmann, *Lex* 441b, mit Berufung auf Bar Bahlū I angibt.

Wer wagt, gewinnt oder verliert. Das oben erwähnte "Halte an dich" steckt, so die hier auszusprechende Vermutung, als "Lege einen Zaun an deine Gier" im masoretischen Konsonantentext, wenn man *wəšamṭā šākīk biblo'ekā* liest. Das ist zu begründen. Es wird angenommen, dass einmal *n* statt *k* gesetzt wurde und dass ein von der Konstruktion des Verbs gefordertes *b* durch Haplographie ausgefallen war. Durch dieses Versehen wird man auf "Kehle" gekommen sein, und das führte auf "Messer". Der Infinitiv *bəlo'* bedeutet "Verschlingen, Gier". In Kgl 2,6 kommt ein *šok* vor, das verschieden wiedergegeben wird: tabernacle (Oxford-Bibel), pavillon (Kahn), tenda (Vaccari), Tempelplatz (Menge), enclos (Jerusalem-Bibel), deutsch: "Gehege". Die Grundbedeutung dieses Abstraktinfinits (nomen actionis, vgl. Brockelmann, *Gramm.* 1,341) ist etwa "Einzäunung", ferner, sprachlich korrekt, kon-

kret gewendet "der Zaun" und "das Eingezäunte". Dieses ist Klgl 2,6 ein heiliger Bezirk, der nicht wie ein Garten behandelt werden darf; griech. entspricht τέμενος, arab. *ḥaram*. Das vorgeschlagene *šākîk* oder *šakkîk* wäre derselbe Abstraktinfinitiv in der *qatil*-Form (Vgl. *Gramm.* 1,356) von derselben Wurzel mit annähernd denselben Bedeutungen. Wir können nicht erwarten, dass alle einwandfrei gebildeten Wörter und Formen der hebräischen Sprache in der hl. Schrift und dem sonst Überkommenen, einer nicht umfangreichen Literatur, auf uns gekommen sind. Mehr als das Gesagte wird nicht erforderlich oder am Platz sein.

Päpstliches Bibelinstitut
Via della Pilotta, 25
I - 00187 Rom

R. KÖBERT, S. J.

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

Estudios lucanos

Los títulos incluidos en la presente nota fueron publicados en su mayoría en 1978, dos en 1977 y uno en 1979. No se pretende por tanto presentar la totalidad de estudios aparecidos en un cierto período. La mención de algunos títulos no implica necesariamente cualidad; ni la ausencia, falta de méritos. El criterio de selección ha sido práctico, teniendo en cuenta los libros enviados a la redacción de *Biblica*. *Biblica* se ha sentido, por lo demás, en la libertad de publicar independientemente de esta *Res* otras recensiones lucanas de obras pertenecientes al mismo período. Véase por ejemplo la recensión de J. Topel sobre el comentario de I. Howard Marshall (*Bib* 60 [1979] 439-442).

En esta exposición trataré primeramente los estudios de conjunto sobre la obra lucana (de un autor, o de varios autores); después los comentarios; y finalmente los estudios sobre textos en particular.

Como he escrito ya anteriormente⁽¹⁾, en los estudios presentes se puede ver la persistencia de una línea, naturalmente con matices. Después del descubrimiento de la teología lucana, durante los años 50 y 60 prevaleció una «euforia redaccional» que paradójicamente valoró negativamente la obra de Lucas. Hacia 1970 y probablemente bajo el influjo equilibrante del comentario de H. Schürmann, la valoración negativa se atenúa. El «reflujo» actual no será apreciado por todos del mismo modo. Las obras que tenemos delante deberían ser situadas en este momento, a mi parecer positivo, de la exégesis lucana.

I. Estudios de conjunto.

La obra de F. Bovon⁽²⁾ ocupará con todo derecho un puesto de honor y servicio en toda biblioteca lucana por muchos años. El trabajo es notable por su claridad de exposición, organización general, riquísimas indicaciones bibliográficas entrelazadas ingeniosamente con las referencias temáticas y cronológicas. Varios índices acrecientan su valor como instrumento de trabajo. El centro de interés de la obra es teológico; los problemas literarios o históricos son contemplados desde este punto de vista y colocan al autor en una línea

⁽¹⁾ E. RASCO, *La teología de Lucas: origen, desarrollo, orientaciones* (AnGreg 201) Roma 1976. Cf. p. X-XI; 173-182.

⁽²⁾ François BOVON, *Luc le Théologien. Vingt-cinq ans de recherches* (1950-1975) (Le monde de la Bible). 474 p. 22,4 x 15. Neuchâtel - Paris 1978. Delachaux et Niestlé.

redaccional definida, pero sin radicalismos ni apriorismos. La sucesión de los temas corresponde a la discusión moderna (1925-1975 aproximadamente): desde el punto de partida, decisivo para la interpretación, la relación entre historia, historia de la salvación y escatología (I) hasta el punto crítico de la obra lucana y la investigación sobre ella, la Iglesia (VII), pasando por los discutidos temas cristológicos, pneumatológicos y soteriológicos (II-VI) igualmente esenciales para la comprensión de Lucas.

La organización de los temas tiene necesariamente algo de artificial, pero es atinada. La longitud del tratamiento es generalmente proporcionada a la importancia de las obras reseñadas, aunque aquí y allá «razones externas de tiempo y espacio» (p. 77) lo han obligado a abreviar estudios recientes. El lector nota más de una vez que una obra ha llegado demasiado tarde, por ejemplo la mención de L. Monloubou (p. 422, n. 1) de 1976, a propósito de la oración en Lc-Ac. En el mismo tema falta completamente J. Caba, *La oración de petición*. Estudio exegético sobre los evangelios sinópticos y los escritos joaneos (Roma 1974), que da larga cabida a textos lucanos. Pero sería poco generoso notar algunas lagunas en materia tan amplia, donde el autor debe hacer esfuerzos constantes para contener sus «velliétés d'exhaustivité» (p. 363).

Más importante es subrayar la ponderación, discernimiento y benevolencia con que se exponen las más diversas opiniones. Pocas veces hay una nota de desazón o rechazo inmotivado de una posición. – Bovon nota, a mi juicio con más frecuencia que lo necesario, el *Sitz im Leben* personal de algunas opiniones, influenciadas por las diferentes confesiones cristianas en las cuales se originan los trabajos. E inclusive atribuye intenciones, no siempre fundadamente (vgr. p. 81). Pero en todo caso sin parcialidad ni prejuicios.

La obra de Bovon no es un centón de opiniones clasificadas y organizadas. Su lectura deja una línea teológica en claro, perfectamente aceptable, en la cual los «pour notre part», «personnellement» y fórmulas similares introducen los aspectos más propios de su comprensión. Lucas integra la realización del plan de Dio en la vida del hombre; esta actualización en su despliegue, puede bien llamarse «historia de la salvación». La vida de Jesús está en el corazón del mensaje de Lucas; y esa vida, detrás de lo «biográfico» tiene un hondo acento «cristológico», que contiene en germen la eclesiología lucana. Ac sobre todo es el campo donde se despliega la Palabra, sostenida por la acción incesante del Espíritu y por lo que el autor llama con gusto y frecuencia las «mediaciones humanas». Estas pocas líneas no hacen justicia a las riquezas de «Lucas Teólogo» tal como Bovon nos lo presenta. Nos hacen más bien desear, sobre tan sólidos fundamentos, un comentario seguido de la obra de Lucas. Por ahora tienen entre manos el estudiante y el estudioso un libro indispensablemente precioso.

Muy distinto en intención y composición son los «estudios sobre la obra de Lucas» que A. George no pudo, anticipado por la muerte (1977), hojear con sus propias manos⁽³⁾. George preparaba un comentario de Lc, ya muy adelantado. Estos estudios eran investigaciones para su redacción. George ha-

⁽³⁾ A. Augustin GEORGE, *Etudes sur l'oeuvre de Luc* (Sources Bibliques). 487 p. 23,3 × 15,8. Paris 1978. J. Gabalda.

bía aceptado publicarlos como desarrollos documentados de lo que en el comentario podría ser solamente indicado. La colección *Sources bibliques* y algunos alumnos del autor han acabado su presentación. De los 18 estudios, nueve son inéditos, y entre éstos algunos tienen un carácter sucinto, pero podrán ser utilísimos para ulteriores investigaciones: son sin duda las notas para cursos a que alude el autor (p. 7). Los estudios están divididos en cinco partes. Los dos primeros artículos son excelentes, casi ya clásicos: «La construcción del tercer evangelio» (1967) aunque acepte demasiado la estructura conzelmaniana, y «El paralelo entre Juan Bautista y Jesús en Lc 1-2» (1970) con anotaciones teológicas y literarias originales y su sugerencia fecunda de una aproximación discreta en Lc a la *synkrisis* de los autores griegos. El lector con prisas podrá saltar «Las narraciones de milagros – características lucanas», un inédito que preparaba el estudio dejado para la II parte, publicado en 1970, «El milagro [en Lc-Ac]», donde los elementos literarios del inédito están ahora encarnados en la teología lucana, y ésta centrada en la «historia de la salvación».

Un análisis muy importante es el de «Israel [en la obra de Lucas]» (1968) con una asimilación excesiva de Lc 1-2 al AT (un tema ya desarrollado por Conzelmann) pero con observaciones muy justas sobre Israel y la misión de Jesús. La comunidad del Señor no es un «nuevo Israel». El rechazo es trágico pero no irreparable. La ruina de la capital es sí un hecho histórico, una prefiguración, un juicio de Dios, pero no el juicio escatológico. Lucas tal vez simplifica demasiado: en la diáspora el judaísmo no escuchará la palabra de Dios, será un pueblo profano como los demás. Este no es sin duda San Pablo. ¿Pero es Lucas? Tiene George suficientemente en cuenta el misterioso y casi imperceptible «yo los sanaré» isaiano de Ac 28,27? Con todo justamente concluye George que a pesar de su interés por la misión pagana, Lucas se ha interesado intensamente en el misterio de Israel. Es, añado yo, otra de las paradojas, o polivalencias, de la obra lucana. – La breve nota «Por el dedo de Dios (Lc 11,20)» (1966) atribuye el cambio de «por el Espíritu de Dios» de Mt al tercer evangelista, para subrayar el pensamiento lucano sobre Moisés y sobre la misión típica del Espíritu, con una alusión a Ex 8,15; pero no todos los autores citados por George en p. 128 n. 2 tienen la alusión mencionada, que además es anterior a Holtzmann (se encuentra ya en Godet, por ejemplo). – El estudio inédito «Los ángeles» supera las preocupaciones de Lc-Ac con un cuadro mucho más amplio, aunque termina por precisar las funciones de los ángeles como «mundo celeste» y como «servidores», que se concretan en Lc-Ac y su reducción delante del Hombre por excelencia, el «Primero» (Ac 3,15; 5,31; 26,23).

Entre los mejores estudios, está «El sentido de la muerte de Jesús» (1973), que podría muy bien pasar de la II a la III Parte («Le Christ», la más unitaria). El material relativo está recogido e interpretado con gran exactitud, los matices del lenguaje, tan importante para expresar un hecho único, pensados y pesados. Con delicadeza y con razón George rectifica (*Bib* 58 [1977] 301: «une fonction (et donc une efficacité) salutaire...») mi interpretación, un poco reductiva de su pensamiento⁽⁴⁾. Los puntos esenciales de la

(4) E. RASCO, *Teología*, 132-133 (cf. n. 376).

cristología lucana se encuentran en «Jesús Hijo de Dios» (1965) y en los dos inéditos «Jesús Señor» y «La realeza de Jesús». En ellos aparece claramente el método del autor, recuento y clasificación del material, y su encuadramiento en la elaboración teológica y redaccional de Lucas, que no son sin embargo una camisa de fuerza, sino el resultado de análisis y lecturas (la de *Die Mitte der Zeit* es bastante acusada) anteriores. Los títulos de «Señor» y «Rey» con irradiaciones peculiares necesarias para su ambiente helénico, son según George los vehículos mejores de la cristología lucana.

El tema inevitable en toda discusión sobre Lucas, la escatología, está desarrollado en los escritos inéditos «El Reino de Dios» y «La escatología», y en el ya publicado (1977) «[El empleo en Lucas del] vocabulario de salvación». Si el Reino es, como en Mc y en Mt, tema central de la predicación de Jesús, su mensaje es más «buena noticia» que «apocalipsis»; es el fundamento parenético de la esperanza y orienta la fe y la acción de los discípulos. El vocabulario de la salvación (*sôzein*, etc.) además de acentos ya tradicionales (salvación escatológica y, por obra de los milagros, corporal), en Ac abraza también sentidos profanos; pero además Lucas lo emplea, típicamente, en casos de salvación de la persona sin relación al cuerpo: fe, perdón, experiencia del Espíritu, vida eclesial; en cierto modo como Pablo o Juan. La escatología es a la vez tradicional: la salvación vendrá; y original: con mayor distinción entre el término, y las desgracias «históricas» prefigurativas. El vocabulario apocalíptico tiende a atenuarse. Es el Espíritu el que en el tiempo de la Iglesia «reúne y santifica las comunidades para conducir las a la salvación final» (p. 347). Otra nota peculiar lucana es su interés por el porvenir inmediato del individuo después de la muerte; influjo helenístico, concede George, pero no menos «la propia investigación [de Lucas] sobre el Señor Jesús». Una evolución análoga se encuentra en Pablo.

La V parte, «La vida del fiel», es heterogénea. Solo un artículo había ya sido publicado en una obra colectiva, «Los ministerios» (1974), y es, en su disposición, metodológicamente ejemplar, al pasar de la comunidad a Jesús. Primero los datos de Ac: Jerusalén (con los apóstoles, los Siete, etc.), las comunidades prepaúlina, las misiones de Pablo y los demás ministerios. Sólo después en una segunda sección pasa el autor al Evangelio: Jesús servidor de la palabra, origen del ministerio apostólico, alusiones a posibles ministerios y otros servicios que aparecen en Lc. Lucas se interesa más en la función que en los títulos, le importa la continuidad viva del Evangelio, la Palabra de Dios que debe avanzar. Si Jesús realizó el evento salvífico, la Iglesia debe ofrecerle siempre su testimonio y en ella obrarán factores humanos. «Pero debajo de estos factores Lucas ve el Espíritu que suscita los ministerios de la Iglesia» (p. 394). Una invitación sin duda de George a la confianza y a la «imaginación». Los tres escritos inéditos de esta parte tratan de «La conversión» (datos lucanos, llamada de Dios y camino del hombre, consecuencias), «La oración» (datos, oración de Jesús, oración en la Iglesia), «La Madre de Jesús» (María en la Infancia, en la misión de Jesús, la originalidad de su figura en Lucas). Estos dos últimos textos unen dos cualidades que han caracterizado otras obras de George aquí no reproducidas: la fusión casi indisoluble de una exégesis rigurosa y una lectura espiritualmente enriquecedora.

Charles H. Talbert ha reunido en *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*⁽⁵⁾ estudios que son el fruto de un grupo de trabajo sobre Lc-Ac (y a su iniciador G. W. McRae está dedicado el volumen), a los que ha añadido algún escrito para el volumen, y dos (los de P. A. Achtemer y R. E. Brown) ya publicados, y que por eso no reseñamos. De los otros solo un breve comentario será posible. F. L. Horton Jr hace un «survey» del problema de los semitismos, sin dejar la pregunta inocente, pero de respuesta difícil, «qué es un semitismo». Horton sigue, pero sólo como posibilidad, la descripción de Wilcox. *Perspectives* no suele citar, sin duda por brevedad, los años de publicación de las obras, pero en un estudio como éste la secuencia cronológica no es indiferente. Digamos de paso que en éste y otros artículos hay bastantes errores tipográficos, y transcripciones griegas defectuosas (véase por ejemplo el artículo de Fitzmyer). — J. B. Tyson al estudiar las fuentes de Lucas repite cosas sabidas; da excesivo espacio a la hipótesis de Lindsay; nos quedamos sin saber qué piensa Tyson sobre el estudio de E. P. Sanders; los trabajos europeos, sin duda discutibles, pero no menos dignos de mención (por citar uno, Boismard) están ignorados. El «holistic approach» (p. 39) propuesto como novedad, ¿no está ya en uso en la mayoría de los estudios lucanos? — Lc y Jn han sido con frecuencia comparados: ahora F. Lamar Cribbs presenta los acuerdos entre Jn y Ac. El tema es interesante, pero las semejanzas no siempre convencen; algunas de las conclusiones son demasiado generales; valdría la pena volver sobre el tema con mayor rigor.

Muchas veces han sido notadas la relaciones entre Lucas y las Pastorales: en esta línea J. D. Quinn propone un único autor que en dos «volumina» ha escrito Lc + Ac y en un tercero un apéndice epistolar con Tit + 1 Tm + 2 Tm. Las analogías aducidas (AT, judaísmo, helenismo) no convencen; pienso, como han demostrado trabajos recientes, que la obra de Lucas termina definitivamente en Ac 28, por no hablar de la diversidad de géneros. Esperamos la obra anunciada por Quinn (p. 68). Entretanto nos llega S. G. Wilson, *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles*, London 1979. — Sobre el perenne problema del uso de Ac para estudiar a Pablo, A. J. Mattil Jr. ha ofrecido una documentada clasificación de cuatro «schools» o tendencias y advierte un retorno o reflujo de una posición radical y fuertemente «creadora», que contrapone dos Pablos, a una «lopsided-Paul view», acompañada de una crítica más restringida. Schuyler Brown intenta precisar la relación entre los prólogos de Lc y Ac y la intención (o intenciones) de Lc-Ac (o Lc y/o Ac). Come se ve, las hipótesis se multiplican. Justamente Brown observa que no pueden bastar los prólogos para esta tarea, y no han faltado exageraciones en ese sentido en estudios recientes; de ahí igualmente el justo deseo del autor de caminar en el sentido contrario: partir de la conciencia de Lucas como autor y como representante de una tradición. ¿Será posible? El presente estudio indica la existencia de relaciones entre el prólogo y la(s) intención(es) de Lucas. Pero no va, o no se puede ir, más allá. — R. J. Karris propone con

(5) Charles H. TALBERT (Ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (Perspectives in Religious Studies). 269 p. 21,5×13,5 Danville, VA, 1978. Association of Baptist Professors of Religion. T. & T. Clark. US \$ 8.00.

decisión y desarrolla con interés un concreto *Sitz im Leben* de la obra lucana: el tema de los pobres y los ricos; de pobreza y riqueza se habla siempre en las introducciones a Lc-Ac, menos en las teologías respectivas, poco o nada como posible «medio de vida». Karris se contenta con levantar la caza, y su estudio se basa en la bibliografía más pertinente sobre el tema. Algunos puntos sin duda son discutibles: no creo que sea la amistad, sino la fe, el motivo que une a los cristianos en los sumarios de Ac 2 y 4 (p. 116). La distribución de los párrafos con números, mayúsculas, minúsculas, parece confundida y no ayuda a seguir el pensamiento (p. 117 y ss.). De todos modos, el autor se contentaría con estimular la discusión y esto sin duda lo ha logrado. — Fitzmyer estudia la composición de Lc 9,7-50, paso que precede el renombrado «viaje», 9,51 y ss. Fitzmyer, inspirado en Conzelmann, analiza nueve breves episodios (hasta 9,56, el primero del «viaje») y los ve como una presentación cristológica que da respuesta autoritativa a la pregunta de Herodes de 9,9. El estudio no fuerza los textos; les da una unidad de composición temática interesante. Queda la duda si no es precisamente la respuesta a la pregunta «¿quién es éste...?» el tema de todo el Evangelio, como ya el mismo Fitzmyer sugiere (p. 143). La sugerencia (n. 29) de leer unidas las dos partes de 9,43, de modo que Jesús sería, con el título de *hō theós*, el sujeto de «hacia» «is tantalizing, but by no means certain» (y noto que ya la ausencia de sujeto estimuló la tradición textual). En la bibliografía sobre el viaje (n. 38), que no pretende ser exhaustiva, llama la atención la falta de la monografía de M. Miyoshi, de 1971.

A. A. Trites resume con brevedad la oración como motivo en Lc-Ac; la parte más interesante, tal vez porque menos tratada, es la que se refiere a Ac. Su conclusión, no nueva, pero bien formulada, es la relación de la oración en Lucas con su teología histórico-salvífica. — Siguiendo una investigación personal precedente, B. J. Hubbard estudia la función de los «Commissioning Accounts» de tipo epifánico en Ac. El «pattern» se cumple pocas veces estrictamente. Sin duda algunas de esas comisiones, situadas en puntos cruciales, dan a Ac una «autenticidad teológica» y unifican el libro con una fuerte conexión con la cita de Joel en Ac 2. — D. R. Miesner ha buscado los «Patterns and Implications» de las narraciones de viajes misionarios de Ac. El estudio se basa en parte en algunas sugerencias de M. Goulder. Hay detalles interesantes pero los paralelismos (a veces antitéticos) convencen poco: son generales o banales. ¿Cómo se podrían contar las cosas si no precisamente así? Un cierto subjetivismo acecha y lo que resulta no es ni un estudio estructural tradicional ni un ensayo moderno de análisis de las estructuras. — Uno de los trabajos que se leen con más interés, y toca uno de los problemas más difíciles de Ac es el de V. K. Robbins sobre los pasajes en «nosotros». Es intrigante el uso de las personas verbales en los viajes marítimos, o en sus inmediaciones, en los autores antiguos. Si ni toda la documentación ni las varias conclusiones del autor son apodícticas, el conjunto es impresionante y arroja nueva luz sobre la presencia o ausencia del autor en los viajes que cuenta. — En cambio el estudio de F. Veltman sobre los discursos paulinos de defensa desilusiona: lo que se dice sobra las literaturas antiguas es más que conocido y su aplicación a Pablo es excesivamente general. — No era fácil repetir una segunda vez el éxito de Keck y Martyn que editaron los

célebres *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Pero Talbert merece nuestro agradecimiento al reunir estas colaboraciones de estudiosos de Estados Unidos y Canadá, demostrando claramente que la investigación continúa.

J. Ernst considera su obra *Herr der Geschichte*⁽⁶⁾, dedicada al eximio lucanista H. Schürmann en sus 65 años, un Epílogo a su comentario. El trabajo es excelente por su claridad. El autor se opone a la conocida tesis de que en Lucas la «Heilsgeschichte» sustituye a la Escatología, no menos que a una salvación sólo mundana sin futuro trascendente. La escatología es, dice justamente Ernst, función de la proclamación de Cristo. Después de una puntillosa refutación de las otras concepciones, el autor expone la propia con sus consecuencias prácticas. En resumen: no sustitución sino coordinación de Historia de la Salvación y Escatología. Para ello Lucas se libera de ciertos elementos históricos de la salvación, a la vez que relativiza la historia con ayuda de las clásicas «señales» escatológicas. Ciertos dichos de una espera inminente no insisten sobre el elemento temporal. El futuro queda siempre como un punto de vista decisivo. Ocasión para esta reflexión, inicialmente problemática, fue para Lucas la experiencia del tiempo. La tendencia innata en la historia, aún en la salvífica, a secularizarse, lo llevó a acentuar el futuro aún por venir. Pero Lucas no ha sustituido el esquema judío de los dos eones por el modelo gnóstico-platónico que comprende el mundo y la existencia ahistóricamente como tiempo-eternidad. La reflexión fundamental de la dimensión vertical de la escatología viene a Lucas, según Ernst inspirado por Flender, de la exaltación de Cristo. El tiempo entre la Ascensión y la Parusía no pierde su valor. Esta «escatología ampliada» no es más que la explicitación de datos contenidos en las primitivas tradiciones. El centro pues de la teología lucana no es ni la Historia de la Salvación ni la Escatología, sino la Cristología: Lucas proclama a Cristo que ha venido, que vendrá, que está exaltado, y que al tiempo presente es experimentado en la acción de la Iglesia y en el Espíritu: Cristo «Señor de la Historia» (p. 112).

II. Comentarios.

Después de más de 40 años de fecundo servicio exegético, J. Schmid cede el puesto en la serie «Regensburger NT». No es una jubilación completa, pues sus méritos eran intrínsecos y representaban lo mejor de la exégesis de estos años (y entre los católicos estaba en la vanguardia). Pero la nueva lectura redaccional y la interpretación teológica de los sinópticos, y concretamente de Lc (teniendo Ac mentalmente presente), no permitían retoques a Schmid. De ahí que RNT haya abierto una nueva serie con Lc como jefe de fila y haya confiado el trabajo a un exégeta bien cimentado, J. Ernst⁽⁷⁾. El trabajo le estaba facilitado por el I vol. de Schürmann (en otra serie), docu-

⁽⁶⁾ Joseph ERNST, *Herr der Geschichte*. Perspektiven der lukanischen Eschatologie (Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien 88). 127 S. 20,8 × 13,5. Stuttgart 1978. Katholisches Bibelwerk. DM 23,80.

⁽⁷⁾ Joseph ERNST, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Uebersetzt und erklärt (Regensburger Neues Testament). 728 S. 22,5 × 14,5. Regensburg 1977. Friedrich Pustet. DM 76.

mentadísimo y muy técnico (y Ernst, aun con parciales disensos, reconoce expresamente su deuda), y al mismo tiempo por el carácter más accesible a todos del RNT. Ernst ha satisfecho plenamente a sus posibles lectores, a pesar de haber doblado el número de páginas con respecto a Schmid. La introducción, conforme a las nuevas exigencias, se abre con unas páginas ricas sobre «la peculiaridad literaria y teológica del ev. de Lucas». En ellas Ernst estudia a Lucas «como primer teólogo de la Iglesia», en su preocupación con el problema del tiempo. Aquí entra naturalmente su concepción fundamental de la escatología lucana, que ha presentado anteriormente a propósito de *Herr der Geschichte*. El prólogo está cuidadosamente elaborado en la línea schürmanniana. Siguen los temas corrientes de la introducción: fuentes, autor (mención crítica de la antigua tradición; punto cierto: se trata de un cristiano helenista que quiere introducir la historia de Jesús – y los comienzos de la Iglesia – en su propio mundo); tiempo (años 70-80); lugar (casi ciertamente fuera de Palestina); relaciones con Jn. La bibliografía es casi exclusivamente de lengua alemana. Comentarios interesantes como los de Creed o Ellis faltan; el italiano o el español ni existen. La bibliografía en el comentario es citada, no al principio de las secciones o en notas, sino al correr del texto. La división del Evangelio es bastante corriente. Cada unidad es traducida, comentada literaria y temáticamente; sigue la explicación de cada verso. Siguiendo el uso de RNT, hay nueve «Exkursus», que sintéticamente dan una visión de un tema (p. e., virginidad, oración, sinagoga). El gran mérito del comentario es su exposición luminosa y segura, con lo mejor de la producción bíblica actual, indudablemente con algunas preocupaciones más peculiares de la exégesis alemana. Se puede discutir sobre no pocos puntos de detalle, sobre la oportunidad de hablar de un «nuevo pueblo», etc., pero el texto invita más a consentir que a disentir. El autor y la colección han logrado con creces lo que se proponían. Es de desear que Ernst, como antes Schmid, sea traducido a otras lenguas.

El segundo comentario de nuestra lista es como el de Ernst el primero de una serie, esta vez del todo nueva, la «Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar z. N. T.»⁽⁸⁾. Los dos pequeños volúmenes ofrecen la posibilidad, aún bajo el aspecto gráfico, de una consulta fácil y rápida. G. Schneider, autor ya adentrado en cuestiones lucanas, ha logrado una dicción compacta en poco espacio, en una disposición semejante a la de Ernst: traducción, visión de conjunto, análisis de versos sueltos o (frecuentemente) de varios juntos. Como en Ernst prevalece la bibliografía alemana; tiene la ventaja de indicar al comienzo de cada sección una bibliografía especial. Los «Exkursus» son breves, pero más numerosos (24), con bibliografía propia. La línea teológica no es muy diversa, al menos en general, de la de Ernst: Schneider duda de que Lc 16,16 fundamente la tesis de Conzelmann del ministerio de Jesús

⁽⁸⁾ Gerhard SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*: I: Kap. 1 – 10; II: Kap. 11 – 24. (Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament, Bd. 3/1 u. 3/2.) 510 S. 18,7 × 11,5. Gütersloh – Würzburg. Gerd Mohn u. Echter Verlag.

como «Mitte der Zeit»; y no acepta la «desescatologización» propuesta por Vielhauer. Con todo en algunos puntos, por ejemplo en las parábolas, sigue menos la línea moderada del precedente comentario. En problemas de tiempo y lugar no hay mucha diferencia entre ambos. En otros puntos la separación es más sensible. Un ejemplo podrá aclararlo: ambos comentaristas tienen una nota sobre la virginidad de Maria, Ernst, pp. 75-80; Schneider, pp. 52-53. El más amplio tratamiento de Ernst entra (en parte) en las características de la colección, pero la diferencia es más honda: Ernst no cree que el dato «concepción por el Espíritu» sea una añadidura de Lucas a la tradición anterior, del nacimiento virginal, y en este punto critica precedentes estudios de Schneider. Este en cambio cree que ha habido esos dos momentos sucesivos. A mi juicio, la historia de la tradición da razón a Ernst contra Schneider. Y no es la única diferencia en el tema. Por ejemplo, las analogías aducidas de otros ambientes culturales son valorizadas diversamente. A pesar de ser más amplio, Ernst se lee con más gusto y facilidad, pero Schneider podrá útilmente servir de control a una lectura demasiado rápida, por su minuciosidad y sus indicaciones bibliográficas más precisas.

III. Estudios particulares.

Desgajando una parte de su amplia disertación, *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus. Die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas*, Stuttgart 1977, U. Busse nos ha dado con *Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu*⁽⁹⁾ «una introducción a la imagen lucana de Jesús» según Lc 4,16-30. Con la separación de la tesis y su inserción en una colección más divulgativa, no sólo se ha abierto el círculo de lectores, sino que la obra ha cambiado un poco: Lc 4,16-30 no es sólo el programa de toda la obra lucana como generalmente se reconoce, aun cuando con matices distintos, sino un «manifiesto» para todos los tiempos de la imagen de Jesús y de las varias acciones o reacciones que su mensaje suscitará entre los hombres. El autor quisiera evitar la periodización de la historia salvífica de Conzelmann, que historifica en el pasado la vida de Jesús (y concretamente Lc 4,16-30); e igualmente la presentación de Schürmann con el esquema de promesa y cumplimiento, que hace de todo tiempo e historia un momento de plenitud (cf. Lc 4,21). Se siente sí más cerca de Schürmann; pero el cumplimiento no puede ser automático [dudo de que ésta sea una comprensión correcta de Schürmann] sino que el cristiano tiene que justificar en cada caso y en cada momento las exigencias de Jesús. Su método será pues no una preconcepción teológica sino el análisis literario. Busse sitúa 4,16-30 en un «paradigma» mayor, Lc 3,21-4,44, con observaciones interesantes; estudia la composición e interpreta detalladamente la escena de Nazaret, que a partir de Mc 6,1-6, es transformada en «episodio». En una segunda parte se ve cómo 3,21-44 (y 4,16-30) encajan perfectamente en la concepción literario-teológica general de Lc-Ac, y sólo entonces el paso evangélico manifiesta su riqueza:

⁽⁹⁾ Ulrich BUSSE, *Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu. Eine Einführung in das lukianische Jesusbild nach Lk 4,16-30* (Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien 91). 134 S. 21,5 × 13,5. Stuttgart 1978. Katholisches Bibelwerk.

un modelo para siempre, en la línea fuerte del universalismo lucano, de la aceptación o el rechazo del mensaje de Jesús. Este último punto está bien subrayado y es tal vez el aspecto nuevo; otras novedades en que el autor insiste no parecen tales. Dado el carácter de la colección, parte de la bibliografía (diccionarios, etc.) podría omitirse; es en cambio penoso que el autor o los que lo ayudaron para el francés o las correcciones (p. 7), hayan sencillamente eliminado todos los acentos (exegese, Jesus, evangile, *et sic de ceteris*!).

En la misma colección, I. Bosold, en su «Zulassungsarbeit» *Pazifismus und prophetische Provokation*⁽¹⁰⁾ intenta explicar el sentido y contexto histórico de la prohibición de «saludar» por el camino, Lc 10,4b. La autora resume brevemente la interpretación antigua de los Padres, y de algunos autores más recientes. Prescindiendo de algunas explicaciones extrañas (O'Hagans) y de otras más interesantes (G. L. Hahn, 1894) corrientemente se interpretaba: no se debe saludar para dedicarse totalmente al trabajo apostólico y/o por la urgencia escatológica. La autora maneja muy bien la exégesis sinóptica, y, en ella, los problemas de Q (con sensible influjo de P. Hoffmann); resume con precisión estudios recientes (M. Hengel, G. Theissen) sobre los movimientos religiosos y sus trasfondos sociales, culturales, políticos, comparándolos con la «comunidad de Q» y sus misioneros. La prohibición pertenecía «probablemente», «plausiblemente», a Q, a pesar de su ausencia en Mt, el cual tiene con todo una «bewusste Rückerinnerung» (Schürmann) un poco más adelante, en 10,12. No descarta las interpretaciones patrísticas y medievales pero por si solas son insuficientes («nicht ausreichend», p. 74). Algunos conceptos usados en el AT o NT, como «acción profética significativa, o simbólica», «parábola profética», no son aplicables, de ahí que la autora describa la prohibición como «provocación profética» (p. 84), que nace de la conciencia profética del carismático o de los misioneros (de Q), con la que confrontan y provocan una decisión pro o contra; la provocación no es un fin en sí, pero llama la atención, excita el interés, lleva a escuchar el mensaje — a pesar, de que el no saludar o no contestar al saludo era mal visto. Junto con las otras normas del contexto (sin bastón, sin bolsa, sin sandalias) era un potente estímulo: provocaba, suscitando maravilla, a menos que provocara excesiva ira; además el no saludar los distinguía de otros grupos (zelotes, esenios), que recorrían el país; por último tenía un sentido demostrativo preparando a la «paz» de 10,5 dirigida a la casa en que se entraba, y restituyendo al saludo su sentido religioso fundamental, renovado ahora por el mensaje evangélico. El «pacifismo» del título, dada la ambigua resonancia de la palabra habría sido sustituido con ventaja por «Friedfertigkeit» o «Friedensbereitschaft» (p. 87); de hecho «Pazifismus», salvo error, no reaparece en el texto. La autora ofrece oportunamente pequeños «exkursus» sumamente útiles para el lector y el tema.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Iris BOSOLD, *Pazifismus und prophetische Provokation*. Das Grussverbot Lk 10,4b und sein historischer Kontext (Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien 90). 98 S. 21,5×13,5. Stuttgarter 1978. Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Con todo, la tesis sostenida con sutileza no es necesaria. En el sentido de la interpretación tradicional, y en el contexto de 10,4b, la explicación mencionada de G. L. Hahn bastaría: como en Ac 18,22; 21,7 y 25,13 el ἀσπάζομαι de Lc 10,4b puede muy bien significar «visitar» (*besuchen*) o «saludar largamente». No es significativo citar (p. 75) las 59 veces del verbo en el NT, sino las 5 de Ac, de las que tres pueden tener el sentido indicado. En Lc, además de nuestro texto, sólo se encuentra en la «visita» a Isabel, 1,40, aquí ciertamente con el sentido de saludar, pero que se prolonga en un diálogo y en un cántico. Bosold concede que la interpretación de Hahn «passt sehr gut» en el contexto. Le quedaría un argumento: la palabra sería redacción de Lucas y tendría un sentido «lucano» (cf. Ac) y no como ella piensa de Q. Pero según ella misma, la presencia del medio verso en Q es sólo «probable». Y además, es innegable que Lucas modifica, a veces sensiblemente, el sentido de las palabras que se encontraban en sus fuentes (Mc o Q, u otras) cargándolas de matices más personales. Χαίρειν en cambio no podría tener el sentido propuesto. Sin contar con que en el plano «histórico» la reacción al no saludar podría ser bien diversa del deseo de escuchar el mensaje escatológico!

La disertación de A. Büchele⁽¹¹⁾ viene a llenar un vacío en un punto central y discutido de la teología lucana, la muerte de Jesús (tema ya antes mencionado a propósito de A. George). El estudio está centrado en una «redaktionsgeschichtliche» investigación de Lc 23. El autor, estimulado por su experiencia personal, reseña lo poco que hay sobre el tema (añado K. Stalder, «Die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesu in den lukanischen Schriften», *IntKiZ* 52 [1962] 222-242, una perspectiva distinta con algunas observaciones interesantes y puntos de contacto con Büchele) e indica con claridad su método redaccional, interesado en la teología específicamente lucana, y el itinerario de la investigación. La I parte la ocupa el análisis verso por verso y estructural, externa e internamente de Lc 23. La II examina otros textos de Lc, desde la Infancia a la Resurrección, relacionados con el tema; aquí también, además de la exégesis particular se descubren las estructuras externas e internas. Una III parte hace lo mismo, más rápidamente, con Ac. A los varios resúmenes parciales se añade uno final, con el resultado de la investigación. El autor la ha llevado con claridad y con método minucioso en el que se percibe la guía del Prof. F. Lentzen-Deis. Además del valor exegetico del estudio, es sin duda una poderosa contribución para definir el sentido de la muerte de Jesús en la obra lucana. Sobre él toda una gama de opiniones se ha manifestado, desde la negación de toda idea soteriológica, hasta la afirmación de un valor salvífico nuevo. Hoy se concede que Lucas no usa categorías de expiación o de culto.

El estudio, sobre todo de la «estructura interna», lleva a descubrir en Lucas motivos cristológicos y eclesiológicos importantes. Entre los primeros, Jesús como el justo paciente y menos intensamente como el profeta; pero todo se funda en su comprensión propia como Hijo en comunión única con

⁽¹¹⁾ Anton BÜCHELE, *Der Tod Jesu in Lukasevangelium. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23* (Frankfurter Theologische Studien 26). 230 s. 22,5 x 15,5. Frankfurt a. M. 1978. Joseph Knecht. DM 44.

el Padre al que se dirige en momentos privilegiados. Entre los elementos eclesiológicos reaparecen constantemente y en formas variadas el del seguimiento, el del testimonio (no sin relación con la *aspháleia* del prólogo lucano), y el tema de Israel y la oferta de salvación en Cristo. Lucas trabaja, al parecer conscientemente, con una «estructura ternaria» que subraya puntos fundamentales; la tríplice presentación de Jesús ante los tribunales, los testigos en grupos de tres, la inocencia de Jesús repetidamente mencionada. Todo ello tal vez en función del célebre texto de los testigos, Dt 19,15 (al que Morgenthaler se había ya referido para sus estructuras «binarias» lucanas).

Sin duda para no alargarse demasiado, la parte dedicada a Ac está poco desarrollada. En cambio me parece tan fundamental como el estudio de Lc 23, la parte dedicada a todo Lc. Y tal vez se debía haber insistido aún más en la estructura global que orienta y unifica todo el Evangelio. Como he tenido ocasión de indicar en otra parte⁽¹²⁾ el caminar y viajar de Jesús, que en cierto sentido comienza ya en Lc 1-2, no termina en Jerusalén al fin del famoso «viaje», sino que pasa por la pasión y glorificación. También Büchele lo dice (p. 196): «El [Lucas] ve la muerte de Jesús más bien en el gran contexto *de todo el camino* de Jesús... comenzando desde su nacimiento y en su actividad pública, a través de la Pasión y Muerte hasta la Resurrección y Exaltación junto al Padre». Era necesario interpretar los textos separadamente, pero no lo es menos insistir en la fuerte unidad estructural de la obra, aún desde este punto de vista particular de la muerte de Jesús.

Sobre el sentido de la muerte, Büchele no está distante de algunas presentaciones recientes. Sin duda Lucas no emplea «categorías interpretativas soteriológicas» (como expiación, cordero de Dios, etc.), pero, contra las esperanzas judías, Jesús es el Mesías que «debe» (plan de Dios!) morir como justo paciente y profeta. Su destino no es pura casualidad, consecuencia sólo humana, sino el plan salvífico de Dios. De ahí que tiene «*heils-geschichtliche Bedeutung*» (p. 193). Como se ve, aun cuando no hay categorías «soteriológicas», sí tiene importancia «histórico-salvífica», y una relación entre ambos términos debe existir. De ahí que no se puede excluir «a priori toda interpretación soteriológica de la muerte de Cristo» (194); sólo falta una «*Heilstheorie*». Y Büchele describe admirablemente cómo en la muerte y por ella se realiza la salvación, cómo ante la muerte se presenta al hombre la posibilidad de la conversión. Así el aspecto parenético, frecuentemente notado en Lucas, se funde con el aspecto salvífico; la muerte de Jesús no es sólo ejemplar sino principio y fundamento de la salvación. Excelente.

J.-M. Guillaume nos presenta en *Luc interprète des anciennes traditions sur la résurrection de Jésus*⁽¹³⁾ su disertación que gira en torno a Lc 24. Pero la intención es distinta: mientras Büchele se preocupa por entresacar la concepción lucana de la muerte de Cristo, Guillaume se interesa también por las tradiciones subyacentes a esa concepción. La división de Lc le ofrece la de la

⁽¹²⁾ E. RASCO, *Teología*, p. 114 ss; ID., «La singolarità di Luca: salvezza di Dio e responsabilità dell'uomo», *Rassegna di Teologia* 19 (1978) 26-42, aquí 38-39.

⁽¹³⁾ Jean-Marie GUILLAUME, *Luc interprète des anciennes traditions sur la résurrection de Jésus* (Etudes Bibliques). 305 p. 24,5 x 16. Paris 1979. J. Gabalda.

obra: la tumba vacía, los discípulos de Emmaús, la experiencia pascual de los Doce (o los Once?), la Ascensión. Dentro de estas grandes divisiones son tratados puntos relacionados con el tema, como el problemático Lc 24,12, la discusión literaria y arqueológico-geográfica sobre Emmaús, la «comensalidad» lucana de Jesús (estudiada a propósito de Emmaús, pero que podría tratarse igualmente en la aparición a los discípulos reunidos). Punto inevitable en el presente caso eran las relaciones entre Lc y Jn. El autor procede siempre con gran claridad, y paso a paso exagerando a veces en los detalles; algunos puntos podían haber sido omitidos o tratados con mayor brevedad: el ya citado problema de Emmaús; algunas discusiones de crítica textual, hoy superadas; el problema de las dos ascensiones (Lc y Ac) con toda la discusión sobre la posible interpolación inicial de Ac, expuesta con los argumentos que el mismo Menoud, como el autor sabe muy bien, posteriormente rechazó; la discusión sobre el género literario de la Ascensión: ya que el autor lo acepta, bastaría una breve referencia a la obra de G. Lohfink, etc. La bibliografía no quiere ser excesiva (p. 10), de todos modos algún nombre sí que se echa de menos; por ejemplo, en el largo estudio de la perícopa de Emmaús, no es citado J. Wanke, *Die Emmauserzählung. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 24,13-35* (Leipzig 1973). Algunos nombres están maltratados en el texto y/o en el índice: en lugar preeminente, p. 10 (y en el índice) «Fullaker», por Fuller; además, Fitzmeyer (muchos autores lo escriben mal), Dibellius, etc.). En el griego se han deslizado algunas erratas; βρώσιμον no es un diminutivo, sino un adjetivo (p. 179).

El valor de la obra está en el rigor del análisis, en el cuidado con que compara las tradiciones, en la atención con que deduce las consecuencias. Particularmente feliz la comparación de las tradiciones que se encuentran (en diversos estados) en Lc y Jn. Guillaume ha medido con exactitud la extensión de la composición lucana, a veces muy larga, pero que comporta casi constantemente elementos tradicionales. El mensaje de Lucas sigue teniendo a Jesús como centro de la historia y cumbre del hecho evangélico. El es el principio del kerigma pascual, más aún, su propio intérprete. Este kerigma en Lucas «manifiesta la modalidad provisoria de la presencia del Resucitado entre Pascua y la Parusía» (p. 267). Lucas insiste en la «continuidad» y hay sin duda, sobre todo en la Cristofanía oficial, un elemento apologético (como en Jn 20,19-29), pero completado por el aspecto teológico-profético de la comensalidad de mesa y vida con Jesús. La Resurrección es no sólo vuelta a la vida, sino entrada en la gloria, preludio (de aquí la pausa cronológica de los «40 días») a la Ascensión. En los textos lucanos hay una progresión en los «testigos» (mujeres, discípulos, «Doce») y en la aceptación (de la duda a la adoración). Y todo ello en el cuadro ya conocido de la historia de la salvación de la obra lucana: introducción a la continuación en el tiempo de la obra de Cristo hasta la Parusía.

Desde un punto de vista del desarrollo de la tradición se puede conjeturar con fundamento un desarrollo que va desde la fórmula kerigmática, tal vez anterior a las de 1 Cor 15, de Lc 24,34 (muy bien analizada), «premier cri pascal», a 24,12 (también anterior a la formulación paulina); luego seguirían elementos comunes a Lc y Jn que Guillaume llama «tradición jerosolimitana», como base de la aparición a los Once; las mujeres junto al sepulcro

vacío vienen de una tradición presinóptica y en concreto premarcana. De otros elementos secundarios es casi imposible precisar la fuente, pero Guillaume afirma que a pesar de la fuerte redacción lucana, hay como dice B. Rigaux «tradiciones anteriores no despreciables». La Ascensión es cierto muy lucana, y el redactor se ha inspirado en formas bíblicas o helenísticas («Ent-rückung»), pero para presentar el tema tradicional de la exaltación.

Lucas no pretende escribir una «historia»: es un obrero apostólico que da testimonio de la Resurrección como los discípulos de antes y los pastores de su propio tiempo (cf. p. 271). Retiene los datos que garantizan la realidad de la Pascua, defiende el mensaje contra objeciones contemporáneas. No intenta en cambio resolver las dificultades que podrían oponer los griegos a la Resurrección (a lo más una alusión en 24,39), si no es por una limitada adaptación del lenguaje. La «hermeneútica» de Lucas, teólogo y pastor, se limita, sin intenciones sintéticas de cristología o escatología, a presentar el mensaje pascual con sus consecuencias para sus lectores. Funde inmejorablemente las tradiciones más antiguas, los datos más sobresalientes del kerigma, con una sensibilidad y «modernidad» (la palabra es mía) dignas de imitación. ¿Es posible sugerir y transmitir más a un cristiano, que la página imborrable de los discípulos de Emmaús? Aún en su forma presente, tal vez sobreabundante, la obra de Guillaume nos lo hace patente y nos invita a una lectura renovada del misterio cristiano por excelencia en su presentación lucana. Una nota final: los cuadros sinópticos que el autor presenta son con frecuencia muy útiles y luminosos.

Los Comentarios a estudios particulares de la presente reseña estudiaban todos a Lc. Sobre el segundo volumen a Teófilo tenemos solamente E. Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4. The Author's Method of Composition*⁽¹⁴⁾. A numerosos estudios sobre la sección de Esteban viene a añadirse el presente trabajo. Su primer capítulo es una «introducción bibliográfica» bien organizada y ampliamente comentada; el capítulo no es superfluo, pero habría sido más breve, si Richard hubiera tenido tiempo de emplear W. Gasque, *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles*, de 1975 (cf. p. 8, n. 28). Richard nota el vaivén de la investigación: de la preocupación histórica, a la de las fuentes, a las «tendencias» o teología, con un interés más reciente en la redacción, que en cierto modo reaviva el problema de las fuentes. Richard procede enfocando cada vez con más precisión su tema: de Ac en general, a los discursos, a la sección de Esteban (narración y discurso). Constatando la diversidad de métodos y de resultados, en el c. II, el autor afronta *ex novo* el análisis del discurso y las citas del AT, según el texto de los LXX (en las pp. 40 y 42, notas, no está claro qué edición sigue generalmente el autor). La comparación cuidadosa de estos textos permite observar la actitud, intención y empleo que el autor hace de ellos y notar consiguientemente su fidelidad al modelo y su originalidad. De cada sección estudiada Richard deduce lo que él llama el «Quoting Process», algo así como una «stream-of-consciousness» (el mismo

⁽¹⁴⁾ Earl RICHARD, *Acts 6:1 - 8:4. The Author's Method of Composition* (SBL Dissertation Series 41). XIII-379 p. 21 x 13,5. Missoula, MT, 1978. Scholars Press.

autor la considera una terminología anacrónica [p. 56]) que tiene su origen en una idea, texto, o término, pero que el autor del discurso desarrolla con gran control y libertad; el «método de composición» será precisamente el resultado de este proceso, manifestado en datos estilísticos, contrastes en los episodios, técnicas de repetición, «patterns» estructurales, etc. (cf. pp. 254, 355 *et passim*). El discurso aparece así, en la línea de las «historias de Israel», como un proceso literario reflejo con una intención específica que presenta a sus oyentes el pasado del judaísmo. Este resultado general es sometido a un análisis más concreto que indica el carácter funcional de los datos estilísticos (c. III), gramaticales, lexicales, estructurales, primero en el discurso, después en las partes narrativas. Una atenta comparación de ambos elementos lleva a la convicción de un autor único. Esta conclusión exigía un nuevo capítulo (el IV) que se confrontase con las teorías corrientes. Por eso Richard amplía la historia de la investigación en este punto, ya que unos pretenden una dependencia total de la tradición, otros prefieren ver la «edición» de un previo documento (por ejemplo Haenchen y Trocmé), otros lo consideran una creación o composición del autor de Ac. En este sentido, como ya antes Bihler, se mueve Richard pero ahonda más el problema. El discurso de Ac 7 no es, como ya lo había visto E. Schweizer, distinto de los demás discursos del libro, ni siquiera de los de la segunda parte; se entiende desde el punto de vista o estructura, estilo y temas. Es una «historia de Israel», basada en los LXX, obra del autor, situada estratégicamente para confirmar las intenciones del autor, y como en las antiguas tradiciones (bíblica y clásica) reproduciendo en el mejor de los modos la visión del personaje central, Esteban. Un resultado semejante se obtiene del análisis de las partes narrativas: junto a datos tradicionales, notable libertad en el estilo y en la estructura. Sólo después de estudiar el discurso y la narración, se puede pasar a la intención de toda la composición, y así aparece su papel fundamental y funcional dentro del libro. En ese momento «histórico» la separación del judaísmo se mueve aún en el plano de la idea, con una evaluación que tiene elementos negativos y aspectos positivos. «Esteban representa para el Autor — y sin duda para la Iglesia primitiva — el intérprete por excelencia de la promesa de Dios al hombre, comenzando con Abrahán, a lo largo de la historia hebrea, hasta la venida del Justo» (p. 358). La salvación nunca se detiene, es dinámica, comporta renunciaciones y una continua nueva comprensión de la situación histórica y eclesial. El Judaísmo no es sencillamente descartado, sino que, según la intención de Esteban (y detrás de él de Lucas) debe servir de fuente y de inspiración. El Espíritu, presente a Esteban, nos debe enseñar que la salvación no tiene límites de tiempo o de «lugar», aun cuando fuere éste el más sagrado hasta entonces.

Si no todo es luminoso en la investigación de Lc-Ac, no hay duda de que atravesamos un periodo positivo en su estudio. Es de esperar que sea fecundo en el campo académico y para las esperanzas del hombre.

Pontificia Universidad Gregoriana
Facultad de Teología
Piazza della Pilotta, 4
00187 Roma

Emilio RASCO, S. J.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Abraham MALAMAT [editor], Israel EPH'AL [associate editor], *The Age of the Monarchies: Political History; 2. Culture and Society*: Benjamin MAZAR [general editor] Alexander PELI [managing editor], *The World History of the Jewish People*, First Series, Ancient Times IV. Vol. 1, p. xviii-386, 61 phot., 4 maps; \$ 39, £ 21. Vol. 2, p. xviii-340, 28 fig., 43 phot. Jerusalem 1979, Mas-sada (Jewish History Publications Ltd.)

The present worthy section of this majestic undertaking contains 24 chapters by 20 different experts. The first volume begins with "The Biblical Sources for the History of the Monarchy" by N. M. Sarna, p. 3-19 (notes 311-314, bibliography p. 372), and "Hebrew Epigraphic Sources" by N. Avigad, p. 20-43 (315-317; 372f); tied up so to speak by H. Tadmor, "The Chronology of the First Temple Period: a Presentation and Evaluation of the Sources", 44-60 (318-320; 373). The history proper is begun by M. Tsevat, "The Emergence of the Israelite Monarchy: Eli, Samuel, and Saul", 61-75 (321-335; 374 giving special mention to P. Nöber's *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus*). Tsevat finds the real rift between Samuel and Saul not in Samuel's antimonarchism or personal animosities but in divergence between the "old, 'sacral'" and the new-secular policies of waging war (p. 72).

"The Era/Age of David and Solomon" is divided into two chapters, B. Mazar stressing the archeological (76-100; 326; 374f) and D. N. Freedman the "literary and conceptual factors" (101-125; 327-329; 375); Mazar thus faithfully ignores all psychologizing of real motivations (76; 97), while Freedman seeks them rather in poetic and editorial insights (102; 109; 112), though both hint at some of the "societal" factors reserved for the second volume. There follow S. Yeivin, "The Divided Kingdom" (126-179), I. Eph'al, "Fall and Exile" (180-191), H. Reviv, "Hezekiah to Josiah" (193-204). Editor Malamet himself treats "The Last Years of the Kingdom of Judah" (205-221; p. 221, "for want of testimony like that of Josephus' *Wars*... we may never know the whole dramatic story"). Finally B. Oded treats the Neighbors on both West (222-246) and East (247-275), I. Eph'al "Assyrian Domination in Palestine" (276-289), and the lamented Y. Aharoni "The Negeb and Southern Borders" (290-307).

In view of current fascination for sociological exegesis, I perused more intently the volume on *Culture and Society*. S. Talmon's "King-[non-]ideology" (3-26) I treat favoringly in *BibTB*. Yeivin's "Administration", 147-171 (308-311; 333), M. Weinfeld under the title "Literary Creativity" treating really our sources for data on the monarchy, 27-70 (286-292), and even M. Greenberg, "Stability and Ferment", 78-123 (296-303) largely cover the same topics as the most "sociological" essay, H. Reviv, "The Structure of Society", 125-146 (304-306); Reviv says indeed on p. 125 "Biblical historiography has failed to deal fully and systematically with Israelite society. Social developments, as opposed to political and religious ones, did not interest the authors of the historical sources" — but in what follows he largely falls into enumeration of terms for officials not unlike Yeivin's "administration". A somewhat different angle is afforded by M. Elat's "Trade and Commerce", 173-186 and E. Stern's "Craft and Industry", 237-264 (as well as "Dwellings and Graves", 265-278). Honestly one cannot help wondering how differently these chapters (and some also of the preceding volume) would have been organized if a single scholar had projected them all and subdivided the materials which were to contribute their portion to a single unified view; or even if the first drafts had been exchanged among them and discussed with a view not only to eliminating overlap, but more importantly to *creating* the overall impression which they would wish to emerge. In daring to say this we do not ignore the supreme importance accorded today to interdisciplinarity, team-teaching, and scholarly autonomy: though precisely an example like this might force reappraisal of some shibboleths.

Somewhat outside the pale of these observations fall the masterly chapters of C. Rabin, "The Emergence of Classical Hebrew", 71-78, and Y. Yadin, "The Archaeological Sources for the Period of the Monarchy", 187-235; he modestly gives precedence to Dan over Hazor and Megiddo (though p. 234, in a helpful recapitulation of architectural data, expresses reserves about A. Biran's *bāmāh*; p. 219, with a two-page spread, reiterates Yadin's denial of all similarity between the Arad temple and Solomon's). It is a pleasure to observe in conclusion that the whole book is very easy to read; fluent style, large print, excellent proofreading all contribute to an *aere perennius* work of consultation.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 - Rome

Robert NORTH

Novum Testamentum

Patrick HENRY, *New Directions in New Testament Study*. 300 p.
London 1979. SCM Press. £ 6.95.

As the present reviewer, in collaboration with G. Segalla, published a book in Italian similar to the one under review (*Metodologia per lo studio della Teologia del Nuovo Testamento*, Marietti 1978) for the use of theological students he does not need to stress his conviction of the necessity of similar comprehensive syntheses which illustrate to the nonspecialist recent advances in biblical scholarship. Patrick Henry does exactly this. His book has those ministers in mind who have long ago finished their theological studies but have not kept up with recent research, and would like to be brought up-to-date by means of a readable presentation flavoured with sound judgement. Laymen with a smattering of biblical learning will find the book useful too, as will scholars who might have lost sight of the wood because of the trees.

The book reviews such questions as the new context of NT studies, questions of continuity and discontinuity between Judaism and Christianity, unity and diversity in the NT, Judaism in recent studies, the relevance of the historical Jesus, Gnosticism, Pauline studies, social studies and the NT, Baptism, Eucharist and Incarnation, and hermeneutics. It is evidently a very wide casting of the net although it by no means includes all subjects. Henry does not submerge the reader under floods of learned bibliography. In each section he chooses one or two select books and discusses them with sobriety. He never terminates his subject without giving his own opinion, an opinion which is always open-minded but sound and balanced from every point of view. Strict Bultmannians may not appreciate his judgements, but then strict Bultmannians are not always over-concerned about what happens when the cat is let among the pigeons in the field of the ministry.

A chapter which is literally a bolt out of the blue is the one entitled "The Apostolic Book and the Apostolic See" (pp. 225-240). It deals with the advance of Roman Catholic scholarship between Vatican I, through *Providentissimus Deus*, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, Vatican II, up to the *Jerome Biblical Commentary*. It is not often that the situation of Catholic biblical scholars is presented with such understanding and sympathy even by Romans themselves, and many Catholics would find this chapter refreshing. The author characterizes recent Catholic research as impregnated by a sense of the Church as institution, by pastoral concern and a sense of tradition. Being a student of Henry Chadwick and Jaroslav Pelikan, Henry is especially sensitive to the tradition of the Fathers.

It would not be useless to add something to what our authour has to say about the subject. The Catholic believer does not receive his faith directly from scripture, as would, say, a Lutheran. He accepts it from the ecclesial community in which he sees the presence of the Spirit of Christ, and whose

spokesmen are the bishops, Ecumenical Councils and the Roman Pontiff. The contents of his *fides quae* are not only the doctrines listed in Denzinger — those are only aspects of doctrine which had to be stressed in particular pastoral or apologetical historical situations. They comprehend also the whole body of revelation living within the living Church throughout the centuries even in its “ordinary” teaching. In its own turn the Church mirrors herself in scripture which she believes to derive from that same Spirit that keeps her alive. Scripture, however, is only a moment in the life of the Church, a life which provides the context for reading the sacred books. This life is as much conditioned by continual reference to the bible as the interpretation of the text of scripture is influenced by the historical tradition of the Church. The Catholic scholar, therefore, cannot, because he himself is a believer, just read the bible as if he were reading the Koran or the Upanishads. His judgement is moderated by the interpretation of the community, a community understood not merely in a synchronic sense but also diachronically. In essential matters of faith he cannot raise himself to judge the Church but will either integrate his interpretation with the faith of the community or will influence the community to broaden its interpretation of doctrine to include recent advance in Scripture studies, as happened in many cases in the second Vatican Council. In matters of pure criticism the Catholic researcher is free to follow his own way. But if he sees that certain positions which have not yet been proved beyond reasonable doubt may place in jeopardy matters of faith, or will cause scandal among the faithful, he will bide his time for the further development of research or for an advanced understanding of the flock, to balance truth with charity.

Via del S. Uffizio, 25
00193 Rome

Prosper GRECH, OSA

R. E. O. WHITE, *Biblical Ethics. The changing continuity of Christian Ethics*, vol. 1. 256 p. 23 × 15. Exeter 1979. The Paternoster Press.

Comme l'indique le sous-titre, ce livre est le premier tome d'un ouvrage dont le propos est de montrer comment l'éthique chrétienne change en restant la même. Cette première partie est consacrée à la morale biblique. Une enquête sur les formes et figures de l'éthique chrétienne à travers l'histoire devrait lui faire suite. Dans l'*Introduction*, l'auteur indique d'ailleurs la nécessité, pour le chrétien d'aujourd'hui, à la fois de se référer aux leçons du passé et, au-delà du texte, de rejoindre le Seigneur aujourd'hui vivant.

Pour présenter la morale de l'Écriture et montrer sa pertinence pour notre temps, l'auteur a divisé son exposé en douze chapitres. Les deux premiers concernent l'Ancienne Alliance; les dix autres sont consacrés au Nouveau Testament; un treizième tient lieu de conclusion.

De l'Ancienne Alliance, R. W. retient d'abord *les enseignements de l'Ancien Israël*(1) tirés du Décalogue, du Code de l'Alliance, des prophètes, du Deutéronome, de la Loi de Sainteté. Il examine ensuite ceux du *Judaïsme tardif*(2) : les Psaumes, les Sapientiaux, l'Essénisme et la « Règle de la Communauté » de Qumrân, la prédication du Baptiste selon les Synoptiques.

L'étude de la morale néo-testamentaire est distribuée de la manière suivante. *La position de Jésus par rapport au Judaïsme*(3) : ce qu'il en rejette et les transformations qu'il apporte à ce qu'il en reçoit. *La famille de Dieu et la vie des fils de Dieu*(4) : comment les obligations des disciples de Jésus procèdent des « privilèges » de leur filiation divine. *Le Royaume de Dieu et la vie d'obéissance*(5) : entrer dans le Royaume, c'est se soumettre à l'exigence eschatologique et christologique de l'obéissance à la loi d'amour dans les divers domaines de la vie morale et sociale. Dans le thème de *l'Imitation du Christ*(6), l'auteur voit le principe fondamental de l'éthique chrétienne, l'expression la plus haute d'une exigence essentielle : s'attacher à la personne de Jésus et agir à son exemple. Les traits particuliers de *l'Éthique de l'Église primitive*(7) sont tracés à partir de la tradition orale de l'Évangile, du témoignage des Actes et des données des premières missions apostoliques recueillies du corpus paulinien. Les deux chapitres suivants sont dédiés à *saint Paul* : à sa *morale*(8), d'une part, en tant que solidaire de sa théologie et de son anthropologie ; à ses *directives éthiques*(9), d'autre part, dans les registres concrets de l'existence : la singularité individuelle, la famille, le travail quotidien, la société et l'État. *Les caractères de la vie chrétienne selon la 1^a Petri*(10) font l'objet d'une réflexion distincte : soumission à l'autorité légitime, valeur d'exemple de la passion du Christ, exhortation à la sainteté et à la pratique des vertus dans un monde hostile. L'auteur dégage les aspects moraux de la théologie de saint Jean dans la section suivante intitulée : *la sévérité johannique*(11). Sous le titre *La discipline sub-apostolique*(12), il présente les autres écrits du Nouveau Testament : la 2^a Petri, les épîtres pastorales, celles de Jude, de Jacques et aux Hébreux, les Évangiles de Mt et Lc, l'Apocalypse. En *conclusion*(13), il signale les traits distinctifs de la morale biblique : son fondement religieux, l'initiative de l'alliance avec l'homme revenant à Dieu ; son caractère personnel, incarné, instaurateur d'une communauté ; sa concentration christologique, la personne de Jésus étant, dans son historicité même, l'idéal normatif de la vie morale du croyant ; sa capacité de se lier à l'histoire et aux cultures en préservant son identité.

Ce parcours est d'abord instructif sur deux points : 1^o sur le propos de l'auteur de « couvrir » la totalité du texte scripturaire (Ancien et Nouveau Testament) pour en dégager la signification morale ; 2^o sur la diversité des thèmes susceptibles d'entrer dans le programme d'une théologie morale biblique. En ce sens, l'idée de cet ouvrage repose sur une juste *intuition* : la nécessité de penser le donné objectif de la Révélation en tant que porteur d'un sens qui concerne l'homme dans sa vie présente et susceptible de manifester à celui-ci les idéaux mobilisateurs d'une manière d'être et d'agir dans le monde d'aujourd'hui. Dans cette perspective, l'inégale importance donnée à l'Ancien et au Nouveau Testament (auxquels l'auteur consacre respectivement deux et dix chapitres) est justifiée. S'il est en effet nécessaire, pensons-nous, de connaître l'Ancien Testament pour comprendre l'événement du Christ,

cette connaissance n'est pas indispensable à l'existence chrétienne. Pour les chrétiens, vivre en fils de Dieu dans le temps présent, n'implique pas, de soi, le recours à l'Ancien Testament; la conduite et la parole de Jésus leur suffisent comme critères moraux ultimes. Quelques questions et observations s'imposent cependant sur la démarche suivie.

a) Du point de vue *méthodologique* d'abord. L'exposé ignore la distinction entre la diachronie et la synchronie, Dans leur succession, les différents chapitres entremêlent la réflexion sur des thèmes bibliques (qui, en principe, oblige à suivre leur évolution selon le développement de la Révélation) et l'analyse d'entités littéraires aux limites précises: tel livre, tel auteur dont R. W. dégage «la» théologie (on s'interroge d'ailleurs sur la raison du groupement des unités qui forment le chapitre 12). Ce télescopage a pour conséquence le manque d'unité dont souffre cette morale biblique.

Cette carence de méthode est aggravée par le fait que R. W. se contente d'affirmer ce qu'il prétend démontrer. Il est exact qu'un problème théologique majeur est de discerner le permanent du transitoire dans les enseignements moraux de l'Écriture, de déterminer le statut de leurs affirmations, de préciser le type d'obligation qu'ils imposent. Mais R. W. ne propose pas de principe(s) herméneutique(s) propre(s) à la théologie morale pour discerner la pertinence particulière des vérités éthiques du *corpus* scripturaire. Ajoutons que nous nous expliquons mal l'«excursus» consacré à Qumrân et son milieu (p. 43-50). Ce sujet reste, certes, captivant pour les exégètes. Mais nous ne voyons pas son intérêt pour le moraliste préoccupé du ressourcement *biblique* de l'éthique. Si on estime - *quaestio disputata* - qu'un exposé des fondements de la morale chrétienne doit compter avec les enseignements de l'Ancien Testament, la matière à explorer se limite évidemment au Canon des Écritures.

b) Du point de vue du *contenu* ensuite. L'auteur n'a-t-il pas méconnu ou glissé trop rapidement sur des aspects importants de la morale biblique pour avoir voulu embrasser trop? Dans ce livre, la mention de l'Esprit-Saint est éparse, ponctuelle (sauf à la dernière page). Son rôle, essentiel et vital dans l'existence chrétienne, n'imposait-il pas une approche méthodique, plus rigoureuse et plus précise? Par ailleurs, n'est-il pas indiqué, dans un chapitre sur la filiation divine des chrétiens, de mentionner et d'examiner la façon dont ce thème a bénéficié chez saint Paul d'une forte élaboration théologique et s'est exprimé dans celui de l'*huiiothesia* (Rm 8,15.23; 9,4; Ga 4,5; Ep 1,5)? Les valeurs morales de la théologie johannique ne méritaient-elles pas davantage que la portion congrue? Pourquoi, dans la brève note sur l'Apocalypse, les chapitres 2 et 3 sont-ils laissés pour compte? Ce sont eux, précisément, qui, dans ce message, sont sujets à une lecture éthique, puisqu'il s'agit d'une parole directe, immédiate, actuelle du Christ glorieux présent parmi les siens en butte aux persécutions et tentés de laisser s'affadir le sel de l'identité chrétienne.

Tout ce qui, dans ce livre, prête à des regrets, s'explique peut-être par les *limites* de l'information utilisée. La bibliographie est uniquement en anglais et étonnamment vieillie. Selon l'index des auteurs cités, les noms les plus fréquemment repris sont ceux de W. R. Inge, L. H. Marshall, E. F. Scott dont les travaux remontent respectivement à 1930, 1946, 1941 et 1947... Peut-on

ignorer que, depuis une trentaine d'années, le travail du ressourcement biblique de la morale est encouragé par de nombreuses œuvres de valeur? Peut-on, en théologie morale biblique, ignorer les noms de L. Cerfaux, Ph. Delhay, A. Descamps, A. Feuillet, N. Lazure, E. Neuhausler, R. Schnackenburg, H. Schürmann, C. Spicq, J. Stelzenberger et d'autres? Notre estime va à l'*intuition* qui est à la base de cet ouvrage. Mais la méthodologie des développements qui la vérifient appelle une révision et l'extension de l'enquête à des travaux récents permettrait d'espérer un *aggiornamento* de la position actuelle du problème de la possibilité d'une morale tirée de l'Écriture Sainte.

Faculté de Théologie
Grand Place, 45
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve
Belgique

Henri WATTIAUX

Bruce David CHILTON, *God in Strength. Jesus' Announcement of the Kingdom* (Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Serie B, Band 1. Hrsg. A. FUCHS). 347 p., 15×23. Freistadt 1979. Verlag F. Plöchl. AS 390.

This is the first volume of the "Serie B (= Monographien)" of the SNTU which also has a "Serie A (= Aufsätze)". The paperback is a reduced reproduction of the typed manuscript which makes for a light copy and tiresome reading. Another inconvenience is that the Hebrew and Aramaic words are transliterated but not underlined or italicized making them indistinguishable from the rest of the text.

The present monograph is an updated version of a Cambridge doctoral thesis (1976) which proceeds with the conviction that linguistic analysis in redaction criticism must precede the assignment of any passage to redaction of tradition. Redaction criticism is not used here specifically to determine the overall theology of an Evangelist. The purpose of the study is to answer the question "in Jesus' public announcement that the kingdom of God was near, what was meant by 'the kingdom of God'?" The author accepts the division of the kingdom logia in the Synoptics into 1) initial proclamation, 2) catechesis, and 3) controversy. Since these interlock, Chilton claims we may not categorize them according to their contexts in the Gospels, but rather according to the functions which they perform as distinct entities. He does this by first determining what sort of language is used with respect to the kingdom — 1) declarative, 2) comparative, and 3) contradictory. Chilton then takes a deliberately limited selection of logia as best preserving the NT tradition of dominical kingdom announcements [(1) Mk 1,14.15; Mt 4,12-17; Lk 4,16-21. (2) Mt 8,11.12 / Lk 13,28.29. (3) Lk 16,16 / Mt 11,12.13. (4) Lk 12,32. (5) Mk 9,1 / Mt 16,28 / Lk 9,27]. These have been singled out because, according to Chilton, it is in these sayings that ἡ Βασιλεία is

declared to be near, and because they are the most direct of the dominical kingdom sayings: simple declarations, not comparisons or contradictions. Here we are most likely to encounter straightforward statements, thereby avoiding the complications of catechetical and controversial figures of speech in the attempt to understand what Jesus basically meant by "the kingdom of God" (p. 21).

This is perhaps the Achilles heel of the study. Is Chilton using a valid principle? Can the sayings be validly divorced from context, for instance, in the study of Mk 1,14-15 and Lk 4,16-21? Chilton calls Lk here a parallel to Mt's and Mk's accounts of Jesus' experience in Nazareth (p. 126). This is a loose sense of the word 'parallel' to say the least, and shows that the context should not be ignored. Besides this, he notes that the passage does not preach the proximity of the kingdom (p. 156) which is the basis of his selection of these passages. The passage does not even mention the kingdom. He gives no convincing reason, then, why he has included this saying in his study to the exclusion of other passages which do speak of the kingdom. Later when he looks at the rest of the tradition of dominical kingdom sayings to determine whether his thesis is useful to its interpretation, he omits passages which, though admittedly belonging to the parables of the kingdom, do not use the term ἡ Βασιλεία. "For the purpose of general discussion it is best to stick to explicit uses of the term" (p. 289, n. 25). It would have been better had he stuck to that principle here. I find no satisfactory reason for his having eliminated the categories of teaching (catechesis) and controversy when the purported purpose of the work is to determine what Jesus meant by "the kingdom of God". Although the study of a limited group of sayings may contribute to our understanding of "the kingdom of God", I would seriously question the validity of conclusions obtained without the corroborative evidence from a complete study.

The bulk of the book (pp. 25-274) is an attempt to apply the method of redactional criticism systematically to the passages cited above. Chilton notes wisely that here "one is operating in the realm of the probable" since "unless one actually has in hand the tradition which was available to a given redactor, one can but guess at what this redactor is creating, what he is transmitting, what he is re-organizing, etc.". The "use of a systematic method can insure that a given guess is at least informed", however (p. 32).

At the end of his investigation, he concludes that 5 of the 11 passages "substantially record Jesus' announcement of the kingdom of God" (p. 277: Mk 1,15; Lk 4,18.19.21; Mt 8,11; Lk 16,16; Mk 9,1, all in modified form). These were isolated on the basis of *via negationis* — eliminating from each passage such diction, syntax and thematic emphasis as appeared to be characteristic of a given Evangelist and of the transmitter of the logia to the Evangelist. In each case he finds that Semitic idioms and the Targum Jonathan to Isaiah were of especial importance in preserving material which seems to have been a formative influence on the thought and language of these announcements. It is on the basis of the Targumic understanding of the kingdom as referring to the dynamic presence of God that Chilton is led to expect that the kingdom of God in Mk 1,15 refers to such a divine manifestation. He claims that his study agrees with the conclusion of J. Weiss

that "the understanding of the kingdom as the 'Selbsterweisung Gottes' was an importantly common element in the Targums and the NT" (p. 279). He understands the kingdom, then, "as the saving revelation of God Himself" viewed 1) as acting now, 2) as moving toward a future, irresistible climax in which He will be fully revealed, and 3) as inaugurated by the strength with which He manifests Himself. In a word, the kingdom Jesus announced is "God in strength" (pp. 284, 287).

In corroborating a conclusion already known but perhaps not emphasized sufficiently after Weiss, Chilton has achieved a remarkable accomplishment. But there remain several questions concerning his method and exegesis. Does Chilton make too sharp a division between tradition and redaction? Why cannot a word be both, i. e., a piece of tradition used in a special way by the author? If so, then the word itself cannot be the determining factor in categorizing it as redactional or traditional (pp. 30f.). Chilton seems to recognize this at times (pp. 30 and 47), but not sufficiently.

At times we must question his exegesis or evaluation of texts. He states on p. 48 that "Jesus is the object, not the subject of the verb κηρύσσειν" in 4 instances in Mk. But I would challenge every one of these. Jesus is not the real object of any of these — so his conclusion is, to say the least, questionable. In Mk 1,7 there is no object of the verb. Jesus is, however, the content of the saying, i. e., "after me comes one who is mightier...". In 1,45 the object is πολλά unless understood adverbially. What is the object of the preaching? The activity of Jesus? It is ambiguous. Chilton does not even consider the possibility that this verb could be understood with Jesus as the subject: "But he (Jesus) went out and began to preach everywhere/much and to spread the word (of God?) so that he (Jesus)...". This would make Jesus the subject of both v. 44 and v. 45, and not change the subject to the cured leper in v. 45. Mk 5,20: here the object is not Jesus but what Jesus had done for the demoniac, i. e., the cure (same in Lk 8,39). Mk 7,36: the object is not mentioned but probably refers to the fact of the cure and in general to Jesus' activity as v. 37 makes clear. Chilton's conclusion is that "to this extent, Mk may see the fact that Jesus preaches to be a self-manifestation of the Son of God". Chilton's evidence for this conclusion is not convincing. The same can be said of his claim that Mk 9,1 is "personally pretentious" (p. 295).

At other times a more careful use of language is desirable. He moves from "appears not to be a source" to "is independent of..." in the next paragraph (p. 91), from a tentative statement to an absolute one without corroborating evidence.

Occasionally his exegesis is startling and based principally upon redaction critical technique or method which he himself recognizes as "subject to the ambiguity of a subjective procedure" (p. 281). Thus Chilton cautions the reader on his own interpretation of Lk 16,16 (Mk 11,12.13) and Mk 9,1 that "the probability of error... is... high" (p. 282). I would certainly agree. He says the expectation of Mk 9,1 is met in 9,4.13 when Peter, James, and John are granted the vision of Elijah and told that Elijah has come. He interprets οὐκέτι οὐδέναι εἶδον of v. 8 as making it clear that this experience is purely an intimation of Jesus' identity and that this amounts for Mk to the kingdom

already having come in power (p. 266). Furthermore, "the ones standing" in 9,1 are taken as members of the heavenly court who do not taste death rather than as bystanders. But certainly those who will not taste death cannot be isolated from "until", ἕως ἄν. To say that the temporal aspect is not to be pressed literally is not a sufficient answer to the fact that "until" normally denotes that the commencement of an event is dependent on circumstances. Chilton says "there is a world of difference between a saying which promises that a human being will not taste death and one which simply refers to those who do not taste death" (p. 270). I would add, more to the point, "there is a world of difference between a saying which promises that a human being will not taste death until a certain condition is fulfilled and one which (by ignoring the future implication and the word 'until') is changed to refer to those who do not taste death ever". Chilton misreads Lk to back up his point when he speaks of "Lk's repeated insistence that Moses and Elijah were standing" (p. 272). Lk says this once. How this can be construed as "repeated insistence" is beyond understanding. Besides, Lk says συνεστῶτας αὐτοῦ which would be difficult to reconcile with "the deferential attitude of a heavenly court".

Lasting and positive results of the investigation here presented are perhaps the conclusion that "the development of the Synoptic tradition has been observed to have been one which was controlled by the desire to preserve dominical logia" (p. 279), and also the stress on the personal aspect of the kingdom, i. e., that the understanding of the kingdom in Tg Is and in Jesus' preaching is that of the saving revelation of God Himself, as God come in strength.

The weakest aspect of the thesis and one which actually questions its usefulness is that so much is omitted. What is the real basis for the identification of the kingdom as the self-revelation of God when the catechesis of Jesus on the latter is omitted? Much of the matter not explicitly treated in this thesis coheres only with great difficulty to the interpretation of the kingdom here espoused. It is clear also that the idea of the kingdom in logia ascribed to Jesus is not to be limited to the Targumic paradigm, as Chilton himself admits. Therefore, the interpretation presented here only forms "a tenable working hypothesis for the investigation of other traditions about Jesus" (p. 293).

Jesuit School of Theology
1735, LeRoy Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94709

Ernest R. MARTINEZ, S. J.

J. MATEOS — J. BARRETO, *El Evangelio de Juan*. Análisis lingüístico y comentario exegetico. 1094 pages. Madrid 1979. Ediciones Cristiandad.

This work, with a brief introduction and somewhat longer appendages at the end, is emphatically a commentary (890 pages, small print). In size, at

least, it takes its place among some ten other full-length contemporary commentaries on John in the languages of Western scholarship. The basic pattern in treating passages is introduction, translation, brief philological notes, verse by verse exegesis (longest part), and synthesis. Indexes cover (Greek) words and themes, but not authors. There are no bibliographies; for we are told that "the only authority is the text" and the precedence given to the text "explains why in this commentary works of other authors are not cited".

As I first glanced through the volume and saw the affirmation that this was to be a new look at John without the baggage of inherited theories or prejudgments, that attitude provoked my interest. I think scholarship needs those who start anew by saying, "Show it to me in the text". Alas, as I read the volume, despite the industry of the authors, my hopes were dashed. I would judge that most other modern commentaries, even though they may be professedly dependent on the theories of previous scholarship, are more faithful to the text and build less "castles in the air" than does this commentary. The exegesis, in my judgment, is frequently based on unproved and implausible presuppositions and really does not explain what is actually in the existent text of John. I regret such a negative judgment, but let me support it.

In the introduction the authors tell us that the two great Johannine themes that give theological structure to the gospel are creation and the paschal covenant (p. 15). After thirty years of studying John, I would never have picked these as the main Johannine themes, and so I was fascinated by the evidence adduced for the claim that *creation* "dominates the chronology" of John and "gives a key for the interpretation of Jesus work". Besides the obvious and admitted reference to creation in the Prologue, the authors count the days in chapters 1-2, so that 2,1 indicates the sixth day of creation, making the beginning of the work of Jesus coincide with the day of the creation of man. Is this being exclusively faithful to the *text* of chapter 1 which does not count the days or to the *text* of 2,1 which speaks of "the *third* day"? We are told that the death of Jesus on the cross which occurs significantly on the sixth day is a culmination of the theme. Yet the *text* of 12,1 states only that "Jesus came to Bethany six days before the Passover". One must admit that if either the wedding feast at Cana or the day (before Passover) of Jesus' death are meant by John to echo the sixth day of creation, the evangelist has chosen a remarkably obscure way of indicating this. The authors tell us that John *insists* on the number six, e. g. the six water jars, the sixth hour (4,6; 19,14), and six feasts. Will the ordinary reader know that in John there is not even a reference to *six* feasts? (The Greek word *heortē* occurs some 15 times; the authors have found six feasts by their own ingenuity but not by Johannine *insistence*). The creation motif is also justified through appeal to the Johannine "designation of Jesus as the Man" ("the Son of Man" (p. 16). Is "Son of Man" really equivalent to "the Man"? Are the authors faithful to the text of the Prologue when they translate John 1,14 as "La Palabra se hizo *hombre*" (italics mine)? Have we proof that Jewish thought in the first century would connect "Son of Man" with the creation motif? Is it correct methodology to interpret the "Son of Man" title without major reference to the other Gospels which give our only

datable contemporary instances of the term as the title of an expected figure?

If we turn to the motif of paschal covenant, the authors insist that the death of Jesus on the cross dominates the Gospel, drawing together all the lines of OT theology woven therein. This conclusion depends largely on a figurative interpretation of symbolism, a good deal of which is subjective. John's Gospel does lead to "the hour", but is the emphatic element in "the hour" death on the cross or return in elevation to the Father? Is there evidence in the text for the claim, "The theology of John takes its departure from the human reality of Jesus made patent in his death" (p. 17)? John describes the death of one who lay down his life and take it up again (10,17) — are either of those abilities very human? John describes the death of one who is in sovereign control (18,6; 19,11), so that Jesus can decide "It is finished" and hand over his Spirit (19,30) — is that patently human? From his body there flows forth not only blood but water (19,34), seemingly fulfilling the promise in 7,38, "From within him there shall flow rivers of living water" — patently is that not more than human? Would it not be fairer to the Johannine text to state that the theme that dominates the Gospel is Jesus as the Son who has come down from the Father as light and revelation and who (in the hour) returns to the Father in glory, with the cross as a stage in that return?

The authors tell us that John should be read as a whole work possessing unity (*unitaria*). Even though personally I think there were editions and a redaction, I agree with that principle of unified reading as faithful to the text. No matter what the history of composition, the Gospel made sense just as it is to the final writer; and so it can and should be *read* as a whole. Where the authors of this commentary go beyond the evidence and begin imposing their own theory is when they claim that a single author disposed his material in an organic and apt manner — the fact that a work is to be read as a unified whole need not mean that it was *composed* as a unified whole. Previous commentators who have found irregularities in the present order are implicitly chided by the two authors of this commentary for not discovering the evangelist's intention that shows his unified plan. For instance, if it seems a difficulty that at the end of chapter 14 Jesus says, "Rise, let us go from here", and yet he seems to remain and speak for three more chapters, that difficulty disappears when it is realized that Jesus' statement is really intended to indicate a change of topic! (Page 651: "The invitation to depart with him indicates precisely the difference of theme" — I find nothing "precise" in such highly imaginative exegesis). The oft-noted irregularity that chapter 5 of John is situated in Judea and chapter 6 in Galilee without any stated transition is solved by affirming that the seeming geographic references in 6,1-2 are really a thematic reference to the Exodus, with the Judea of chapter 5 as the place of servitude. I find this solution more extravagant than the expedient of changing the order of the chapters — a solution that hitherto I thought the most extravagant (and unnecessary). The authors suggest the following division of John (understood as a work composed as a unified whole): Prologue, Introduction (1,19-51), Part One (chapters 2-19), Part Two (chapter 20), Epilogue. Almost any division of John is subjective;

but if one wishes to argue plausibilities *from the text*, does not the evangelist give a fairly clear signal of summary and change at the end of chapter 12 and at the beginning of chapter 13? Does he give any comparable signal for the major division of parts between chapters 19 and 20? There is little *a posteriori* about a major division between 1,51 and 2,1.

Turning now to the treatment of individual passages, let me first state that obviously the authors are learned, and indubitably there are elements of value in their notes and comments. Nevertheless, the points they emphasize are so curious that I find this commentary highly imaginative. For instance, the marriage feast of Cana (2,1) has symbolic value because Jesus is the new spouse (of Israel) as announced through the mouth of John the Baptist in 1,15.27.30 (p. 147). If one looks up the three *texts*, one will search in vain for the language of espousal; but the two authors (who find "clear" allusion to levirate marriage and "man" as husband) refer the reader to 3,29 where it does appear. In other words, one is to interpret the wedding reference in 2,1 through an espousal reference that does not occur clearly until considerably later in the text! The authors cite the principles of rabbinic exegesis making connections between passages (p. 24), but those principles tell us how the *rab-bis* read and interpreted a known work such as the Torah. They do not tell us what the *composers* of the various books of the OT meant. Similarly, the use of such principles by Mateos and Barreto may tell me what they read into John by combining various passages; but was such imaginative combination in the mind of the evangelist? Would the *composer* of the Gospel expect the reader of 2,1 to have in mind information not given until 3,29? In my judgment the two authors of this commentary are closer to modern idiosyncratic exegesis than to rabbinic exegesis.

Let me give another example. The authors translate the obscure Greek localization of 5,2 as "junto a la Ovejera, una piscina... con cinco pórticos", explaining that *probatikē* stands for *hē pylē tēs probatikēs* and that John has *deliberately* omitted the "Gate" from "Sheep Gate". This is in order to facilitate a connection with the sheep expelled from the Temple (2,14) who were a symbol of the people and to prepare for the discourse on the shepherd of the sheep in chapter 10. The porticoes, on the other hand, "establish a relation between this place and the Temple", for in 10,23 the Portico of Solomon is in the same context as the shepherd discourse. There are innumerable examples of such interpretation; readers of the review can decide whether I am justified in considering it arbitrary.

Let me conclude by pointing to some factors that are absent from the commentary. The absence is surely deliberate and undoubtedly would be defended by the authors as part of their methodology; for me the absence renders the commentary inadequate. I refer especially to the absence of serious discussions of historicity and of the *Sitz-im-Leben* of the evangelist and his community. One may reply that these are modern questions, but the commentary is written for twentieth-century readers and should supply them with direction on questions that will inevitably be asked if they have read any modern discussion of the NT. Moreover, such questions have implications for Christianity lived in our times. For example, while there is a note on "the Jews" (pp. 86-87), I find no serious discussion of whether the histor-

ical Jesus could have spoken thus and of what the term implies by way of late first-century Christian mentality. It is, after all, a generalization appearing on Jesus' lips, very often in relation to his enemies. Should not exegesis raise the issue of what this suggests about "the Jews" as enemies of the Johannine Christians? In 8,44 Jesus says to Jews, "You are of your father, the devil"; and the authors have a note justifying the translation of *diabolos* as "Enemy" and a comment explaining that the issue is one of idolatry. But the modern reader must be asked to reflect on whether Jesus really said such a thing and what it means that the Johannine author made such an opprobrious charge. I am quite skeptical about letting modern "relevancy" dominate exegesis; but after the Spanish Inquisition and the German "Ultimate Solution", the Christian reader of a thousand-page commentary deserves some light on the normative or non-normative character of such statements appearing in a canonical, inspired work and attributed to one who says only what he heard in the presence of the Father.

If we turn to historicity and christology, I have often told students that a clear example of a statement attributed to Jesus that was never said by him is John 17,3 where he calls himself "Jesus Christ". I cannot find that the authors discuss the problem, apparently because they think they have resolved it by the translation "Jesús Mesías". On p. 711 we find, "Now he designates himself as 'Messiah' signifying his historical mission with regard to men". By their use of the word "historical" are the authors telling us that in his ministry Jesus did speak of himself as the Messiah? That is a crucial question in christology, and readers need some light upon it. I searched the notes and comments on the texts dealing with expulsion from the synagogue (9,22; 16,2) wondering whether the authors would indicate when this happened and how it affected the evangelist and his community. I found myself frustrated and then realized with some amusement that the authors could indignantly reply to me that they had discussed "community" in this commentary. In the introduction on p. 25 there is a clear statement: "The feminine figure that represents the community as spouse of Jesus is Mary Magdalene, who appears for the first time at the foot of the cross in parallel with the Disciple (19,25-27) and who will constitute with Jesus the new primordial pair which gives a beginning to the new humanity (20,11ff)". That statement can serve as well as any in summing up my difficulty with this commentary.

Union Theological Seminary
3041 Broadway St.
New York, NY 10027
U. S. A.

Raymond E. BROWN, S. S.

Graham HUGHES, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics*. The Epistle to the Hebrews as a New Testament example of biblical interpretation (Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 36). xii-218 p. 22 x 14. Cambridge 1979. Cambridge University Press. About £ 10.50 net.

Hebrews and Hermeneutics is not an easy book to read. First there is the maddening physical inconvenience (presumably alleged to be unavoidable) of having the numerous footnotes placed at the back of the book, separate from the text. (Do editors who plan such arrangements ever read what they wreak?) Then, more basically, there is the subject matter: hermeneutics is not the easiest subject matter in the field of biblical research, nor, for that matter, is the Epistle to the Hebrews. Finally (and here one comes to the heart of the matter), Hughes is simply not gifted with the charism of clarity. One constantly seems to be looking through field glasses at a distant landscape which never quite comes into focus. The repeated use of italics to emphasize English words shows that the author is not fully in command of what he is writing.

Hence it is with a certain hesitation that the reviewer makes the following summary and comments. The fundamental purpose of the book is twofold: 1) to examine the understanding of the Old Testament on the part of the author of Hebrews to see how he manages to view it as being still the same God's Word it was for those who revered it before the coming of Christ; 2) to assess the implications of this examination for contemporary hermeneutics (pp. 3-4). Hughes devotes three of his four chapters to a rather eclectic study of Hebrews. Chapter 1 (pp. 5-34) states that the basic truth of the prologue (1,1-4) — Jesus is the Son in whom God has definitively spoken — is developed in subsequent chapters through three comparisons: with the angels (1,5-2,4), with Moses (3,1-4,13), and with the Aaronite priesthood (4,14-5,10; 7,1-28). Hughes maintains (p. 30) that "the deepest question for the writer has not been that concerning the means of atonement, nor that of how to encourage others to a more elevated life, but that of the historical elongation of the divine self-disclosure." Chapter 2 (pp. 35-74) establishes first that the author's conception of God is the basis for the continuity between Christians and the Old Testament; in the Old Testament texts themselves there is the basis for a continuity in form with the later Christian interpretation of them because they are open to the future, but there is also a discontinuity which is caused ultimately by the relation of Christians to the eschaton. History, then, is the key for understanding how the Old Testament achieves Christian status. Chapter 3 (pp. 75-100) shows that memories of the historical Jesus served as guidelines permitting the faith of the author of Hebrews to mold his Christology out of Old Testament texts. Chapter 4 (pp. 101-136) applies all this to Christian understanding of the Bible. The forms of biblical expression are only partial and piecemeal; it is the faith of the interpreter which gives them full meaning. The historical-critical method is intrinsically limited as a tool for interpreting Scripture: unless it be com-

plemented by the faith of the interpreter it can only separate the possible meanings from the impossible.

There are a number of good points which Hughes makes. For example, the stress on Jesus as the Word ("the 'all-but-explicit "Logos-doctrine"'" [p. 5]) (though the reviewer is not as sceptical as Hughes about the possibility of explicit references to Jesus as Logos in Heb 4,12-13). Also felicitous is Hughes' emphasis on the positive aspects of the use of Ps 95 in Heb 3,12-4,2 (cf. pp. 11-12) (but he should have extended this influence up until 4,11). Finally, well-taken is Hughes' emphasis on the use by the author of Hebrews on traditions about Jesus (pp. 90, 95) (but more needs to be done to ground Christology where it began — in Jesus' manifestation of his own self-awareness [cf. p. 180, n. 96]).

But despite these and a number of other random good points this is a frustrating and disappointing book and here are some of the reasons why: 1) Exaggeration of the interest of the author of Hebrews in the "historical elongation of the divine self-disclosure". Certainly this is a point emphasized by the author, but it is definitely subordinate to his marveling at the unexpected form this self-disclosure has taken in the God-Man Jesus and in what Jesus has done. And it is not the immediate aim of the epistle, which is rather to effect a change in the wavering outlook of the addressees. 2) Too casual an exegesis of the epistle. Hebrews is an immensely sophisticated writing where each word has a place. It cannot be summed up in a few dozen pages of impressionistic observations. To take one example. Hughes rightly stresses the importance in Hebrews of the oblation of Christ's will as being the decisive aspect for his sacrifice (p. 89; cf. Heb 10,7). But he implies that the physical shedding of blood is thereby relegated to the ineffectual cult of the Old Testament, suggesting that the primacy of disposition and the necessity of the shedding of blood are mutually exclusive, which they are not. When one puts Heb 9,19-20 together with 3,5 and 2,3 one sees the risks which this superficiality entails with regard to discovering what the author of Hebrews is saying. 3) Failure to come to grips with the hermeneutics of the author of Hebrews on his own terms. It is not enough to mention in passing techniques of interpretation common to the author of Hebrews and to exegetes contemporary with him (p. 59 with n. 102). If one is interested in the techniques of the author in interpreting the Old Testament one has to get down to the basics of what that exegesis implied in terms proper to the author. For example, with regard to the use of *gezerah shawah* in Heb 4,4-5, what was the force of the use of *gezerah shawah* in Jewish exegesis? Is it true, as at times seems suggested by its use, that it can be used simply as a device to use Scripture to illustrate a truth known from a different source; say, tradition?

No really satisfactory book on Hebrews and hermeneutics will be written until a detailed exegesis of the entire epistle is used as the basis for a study of the hermeneutic principles of the author of Hebrews in his own terms, insofar as that is possible.

But the reviewer would like to go on even beyond this critique to question Hughes' basic hermeneutic principles which he holds in common with so many other scholars today. Hughes acknowledges the importance of the dis-

tion between "meaning" and "significance" made by E. D. Hirsch's *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven 1967; p. 188, n. 68), but does not hold with Hirsch that the meanings of texts are unchangeable. For the reviewer this seems to be a misunderstanding of what "meaning" and "significance" stand for. The matter is obviously much too complicated to treat at length here, but one observation seems worth making: that the distinction between "meaning" and "significance" is valid not only for interpreters of a text in a setting different from that envisioned by the author but also for the interpreters of the text in its original setting and even for the author himself.

And here an ending is possible on an eminently valid aspect of Hughes' book: his insistence on stressing God's self-disclosure in Christ and the role of faith in coming to terms with that self-disclosure. Hughes' deficient hermeneutics with regard to "meaning" and "significance" weakens his explanation of how contact is made through a text with a person; but his emphasis on faith puts the whole matter in the perspective of the author of Hebrews, the only perspective in which that author (or any biblical author) is fully intelligible.

Pont. Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Mitchell Dahood, S.J. (1922-1982): In Memoriam

This issue of *Biblica* contains some of the last work of our most diligent contributor. Typically Fr. Mitchell Dahood died in the midst of prayer and work and left a number of manuscripts behind him. He was struck down without warning by a heart attack as he entered a chapel of the Madonna in the church of Sta. Maria in Via to pray as he was returning from an art exhibit. It was one of the many places he favored for such moments of prayer. Had he thought about it, he would probably have chosen just such circumstances for his death.

Fr. Dahood was born Feb. 2, 1922 at Anaconda, Montana (U.S.A.). He grew up there and across the continent in Salem, New Hampshire. On September 7, 1941 he entered the New England Province of the Society of Jesus and on June 19, 1954 he was ordained a priest. His Semitic studies were done under W.F. Albright at Johns Hopkins where he took his Ph. D. in 1951. In 1956 he took the chair of Northwest Semitic Languages in the Oriental Faculty of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, where he remained until his death. A tremendous worker, his bibliography runs to well over 300 items. Many of these were short notes, but his three volumes on the psalms in the Anchor Bible series is a major work. So too his "Ugaritic-Hebrew Lexicography" amounting to 207 pages printed in instalments in *Biblica* from 1963 to 1974 and the 550 pages he contributed to the three volumes of *Ras Shamra Parallels* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1972, 1975, 1981). Besides writing he contributed to scholarship as dean of the Oriental Faculty of the Biblical Institute from 1975 to 1978 and by directing the monograph series *Analecta Orientalia* and *Studia Pohl* from 1972 until his death.

His energy, deep personal interest, and astounding command of the MT and the Ugaritic texts made him a fascinating lecturer and a favorite with students. In recent years his recognized, if controversial, stature as a scholar allowed even wider audiences to enjoy his qualities as a lecturer. He was frequently invited to speak at academic meetings and at universities. In the past year alone he spoke in Malta, at Vienna, Paris and many schools in the British Isles and in the United States. This mass of invitations was a mark of honor for his work. There were more formal signs as well. Holy Cross College awarded him an honorary D. Litt., and last year he was president of the Catholic Biblical Association of America.

There is no denying that many disagreed with the method and the results of his continuous labor. This was especially true after he became engaged with Ebla (and, incidentally, was introduced to a wider, non-specialist au-

dience through *The National Geographic* and *Time*). He was the object of some harsh attacks in print. As far as I know he never replied in kind or deviated from the courteous, objective presentation of his own positions. Full in interest in his subject and a hard worker he remained humorous about it all, often saying that if only a small percentage of his suggestions took hold he would consider himself a success. In fact, so little was he given to thinking of these suggestions as his, so thoroughly was he dedicated to his text, that he seemed to thrive on the attacks for they stimulated him to more work on the material.

Perhaps these last remarks will help show why those of us who were privileged to know him well feel his loss so keenly. A strong personality but gentle and full of humor, a scholar guided by a simple Christian piety, he was everything to everyone. He discussed academics, but he was also at home with the man on the street talking about Italian soccer or politics – or American baseball. On another level he knew and loved music and the arts. No wonder that one who knew him well still seem to meet “Mitch” at every turn and will long continue to do so.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

Dennis J. MCCARTHY, S.J.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

All books and fascicles in anyway connected with the biblical field sent to *Biblica* are listed here. No judgment about the book is implied by the fact of its being listed.

Further mention of the book in *Biblica* depends on the Book Review Editor's judgment. Inclusion of a book in this list neither guarantees nor precludes subsequent review.

Articles sent to *Biblica*, as well as all books and fascicles of books, are made available to the editor of the *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus* published by the Pontifical Biblical Institute. The editor of the *Elenchus* may include them or not include them in his listings as he sees fit.

All material destined for review is to be sent to: Directio *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, 00187 Roma, Italy.

Vetus Testamentum

Aberbach, Moses – **Grossfeld, Bernard**, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis. A Critical Analysis With An English Translation of the Text* (Based on A. Sperber's Edition). 376 p. 23,4×15,6. New York 1982. KTAV. US \$ 35.00.

Amsler, Samuel – **Lacocque, André** – **Vuilleumier René**, *Aggée, Zacharie 1–8, Zacharie 9–14, Malachie* (Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament XIc). 262 p. 23,8×17,3. Neuchâtel – Paris 1981. Delachaux & Niestlé.

Beek, M. A., *Jozua* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament). 256 p. 23×15,3. Nijkerk 1981. G. F. Callenbach. Gld 57,50.

Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia. Series IV. *Targum Palaestinense in Pen-tateuchum*. Additur Targum Pseudojonatan ejusque hispanica versio. L. 2 *Exodus*. Editio critica curante Alexandro Diez Macho, adjuvantibus L. Diez Merino, E. Martinez Borobio, T. Martinez Saiz, R. Griffo. xxv-334 p. 30,5×22,5. Matriti 1980. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas.

Biblia Sacra, Iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem ad Codicum Fidem iussu Ioannis Pauli PP. II. Cura et studio Monachorum Abbatiae Pontificiae Sancti Hieronymi in Urbe Ordinis Sancti Benedicti. Edita XVI: *Liber Danielis* ex interpretatione Sancti Hieronymi cum praefationibus et variis capitulorum seriebus. XLVI-172 p. 29,5×21. Romae 1981. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis.

Bogaert, Pierre (et alii), *Le Livre de Jérémie*. Le prophète et son milieu, les Oracles et leur transmission (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium LIV). 413 P. 24×16. Leuven 1981. Peeters – University Press. FB 1500.

Collins, John J. - Nickelsburg, George W. E., *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms* (SBL, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12). XII-258 P. 21,5×13,7. Chico, CA 1980. Scholars Press. US \$ 10.50.

Cox, Claude E., *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy* (Armenian Texts and Studies 2). XXIV-415 p. 22,2×14,9. Chico, CA, 1981. Scholars Press. US \$ 8.00.

Davies, Eryl W., *Prophecy and Ethics. Isaiah and the Ethical Traditions of Israel* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 16). 184 p. 22,3×13,2. Sheffield 1981. JSOT Press. £ 9.50.

Deram, Robert, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 12). VIII-124 p. 22,7×15,2. Washington 1981. The Catholic Biblical Association of America. US £ 4.50.

Emerton, J. A. (Ed.), *Congress Volume Vienna 1980* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum XXXII). XII-483 p. 24,5×16. Leiden 1981. E. J. Brill. Gld 284.

Friedman, Richard Elliott, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative. The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 22). IX-151 p. 22,2×14,5. Chico, CA. 1981. Scholars Press. US \$ 12.00.

Jeremias, Jörg - Perlitt, Lothar, [Hrsg], *Die Botschaft und die Boten.* Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag. 426 p. 22,5×15. München - Göttingen 1981. Neukirchener Verlag.

Kenyon, Kathleen M., *Excavations at Jericho. Volume Three. The Architecture and Stratigraphy of the Tell with contributions by R. Burleigh, I. W. Cornwall, G. Kurth, and O. Röhrer-Ertl.* Thomas A. Holland, Editor. I, Text. XXIII-540 p. II, XXXII p. - 343 Plates. 28,3×22. London 1981. British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.

Kidner, Derek, *Love to the Loveless. The Story and message of Hosea* (The Bible Speaks Today). 142 p. 19,8×12,5. Leicester 1981. Inter-Varsity Press. £ 3.25.

Lang, Bernhard (Hrsg.), *Der einzige Gott. Die Geburt des biblischen Monotheismus. Mit Beiträgen von Bernhard Lang, Morton Smith und Hermann Vorländer.* 148 S. 22×13,5. München 1981. Kösel.

Lemaire, André, *Le scuole et la formazione della Bibbia nell'Israele antico* (Studi Biblici 57). Traduzione E. Gatti. 130 p. 20,3×13,8. Brescia 1981. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 4.000.

Oberforcher, Robert, *Die Flutprologe als Kompositionsschlüssel der biblischen Urgeschichte.* Ein Beitrag zur Redaktionskritik (Innsbrucker Theologische Studien 8). 677 S. 22,5×15. Innsbruck - Wien - München 1981. Tyrolia. DM 118.

Patrick, Dale, *The Rendering of God in the Old Testament* (Overtures to Biblical Theology 10). xiv-148 p. 21,5 × 13,9. Philadelphia 1981. Fortress Press. US \$ 8.95.

Payne, David F., *Kingdoms of the Lord*. A History of the Hebrew Kingdoms from Saul to the Fall of Jerusalem. xviii-310 p. 24 × 16,3. Exeter 1981. Paternoster Press. £ 10.60.

Petersen, David L., *The Roles of Israel's Prophets* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 17). 131 p. 21,6 × 13,5. Sheffield 1981. JSOT Press. £ 7.50.

Pons, Jacques, *L'oppression dans l'Ancien Testament* (Ouvrage publié avec le concours de l'Institut Protestant de Théologie). 250 p. 23 × 15,5. Paris 1981. Letouzey et Ané. FF. 120.

Ravasi, Gianfranco, *Il Libro dei Salmi*. Commento e attualizzazione. Volume 1 (1-50) (Lettura pastorale della Bibbia 12). 917 p. 24 × 17. Bologna 1981. Edizioni Dehoniane. Lit. 28.000.

Sonsino, Rifat, *Motive Clauses in Hebrew Law*. Biblical Forms and Near Eastern Parallels (SBL, Dissertation Series 45). xix-336 p. 22,7 × 15,4. Chico, CA 1980. Scholars Press. US \$ 9.00.

Stowers, Stanley Kent, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBL, Dissertation Series 57). xvii-261 p. 22,7 × 15,4. Chico, CA 1980. Scholars Press. US \$ 13.50.

Scharbert, Josef, *Sachbuch zum Altem Testament*. 534 p. 17,5 × 23,5. Tafeln, 40 einfarbige Abbildungen in Text. Aschaffenburg 1981. Pattloch. DM 64.

Schreiner, Josef, *Jeremia, 1-25,14*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament mit der Einheitsübersetzung (Die Neue Echter Bibel). Herg. von Weihbischof Josef Plöger und Josef Schreiner. 148 S. 23,5 × 15,5. Würzburg 1981. Echter Verlag. DM 28.

Schweizer, Harald, *Metaphorische Grammatik*. Wege zur Integration von Grammatik und Text interpretation in der Exegese (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 15). xiii-346 p. 21 × 14,8. St. Ottilien 1981. EOS Verlag. DM 38.

Talmon, S., *Textus* (The Hebrew University Bible Project IX). 136 p. 24 × 17. Jerusalem 1981. Magnes Press.

Tov, Emanuel, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3). 343 p. 21,2 × 13,5. Jerusalem 1981. Simor. US \$ 17.00.

Turdeanu, Emile, *Apocryphes Slaves et Roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testament Pseudepigrapha V). xii-485 p. 24,5 × 16,4. Leiden 1981. E. J. Brill. Gld 156.

Van der Heide, Albert, *The Yemenite Tradition of the Targum of Lamentations*. Critical Text and Analysis of the Variant Readings (Studia Post-Biblica 32). 193 p. 24,5 × 16. Leiden 1981. E. J. Brill. Gld 100.

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel, nach Petrus Sabatier. New gesammelt und herausgegeben von der **Erzabtei Beuron**. 25. Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos. Herausgegeben von Hermann Josef **Frede**. 9. Lieferung. p. 641-720. Freiburg 1981. Herder.

Weippert, Helga, *Schöpfer des Himmels und der Erde*. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Jeremiabuches (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 102). 111 p. 20,7 × 13,5. Stuttgart 1981. Katholisches Bibelwerk. DM 21.80.

Novum Testamentum

Alves, Manuel Isidro, *Il Cristiano in Cristo*. La presenza del cristiano davanti a Dio secondo S. Paolo. 407 p. 24,5 × 18,5. Braga 1980. Edições Theologica.

Balch, David L., *Let Wives be Submissive*. The Domestic Code in I Peter (SBL, Monograph Series 26). 187 p. 22,9 × 15. Chico, CA, 1981. Scholars Press. US \$ 21.00.

Bossuyt, Philippe – Radermakers, Jean, *Jésus Parole de la Grâce selon saint Luc*. 1. Texte. 104 p. 2. Lecture continue. 552 p. 24 × 16. Bruxelles 1981. Institut d'Études Théologiques. FB 710.

Dewy, Joanna, *Markan Public Debate*. Technique; Concentric Structure; and Theology in Mark 2,1-3:6 (SBL, Dissertation Series 48). xii-277 p. 22,7 × 15,4. Chico, CA 1980. Scholars Press. US \$ 7.50.

Dumais, Marcel, *L'Actualisation du Nouveau Testament*. De la réflexion à la pratique (Lectio Divina 107). 177 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Paris 1981. Le Cerf.

Elliott, John H., *A Home for the Homeless*. A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy. xiv-324 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Philadelphia 1981. Fortress Press. US \$ 24.95.

Finegan, Jack, *The Archeology of the New Testament*. The Mediterranean World of the Early Christian Apostles. xxxii-250 p. 26 × 18. Boulder, CO. – London, England 1981. Westview – Croom Helm. £ 19.95

Forestell, J. T., *Targumic Traditions and the New Testament*. An annotated Bibliography with a New Testament Index (SBL, Aramaic Studies 4). xiii-137 p. 22,9 × 15,2. Chico, CA 1979. Scholars Press. US 412.00.

Fuchs, Eric – Raymond, Pierre, *La deuxième épître de Saint Pierre; l'Épître de Saint Jude* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, deuxième série, XIIIb). 194 p. 23,8 × 17,3. Neuchâtel – Paris 1980. Delachaux & Niestlé S. A.

Funk, Aloys, *Status und Rollen in den Paulusbriefen*. Eine inhaltsanalytische Untersuchung zur Religions-soziologie (Innsbrucker Theologische Studien 7). 224 S. 22,5 × 14,9. Innsbruck - Wien - München 1981. Tyrolia. DM 38.

Guerra Gomez, Manuel, *El Idioma del Nuevo Testamento*. Gramática, Estilística y Diccionario estadístico del Griego Bíblico (Facultad de Teología del Norte de España, Sede de Burgos). 418 p. 24,9 × 16,9. Burgos 1981. Ediciones Aldecoa.

Hengel, Martin, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers* (Studies of the New Testament and its World). Translated by James C. G. Greig. 111 p. 22 × 14,2. Edinburgh 1981. T. & T. Clark. £ 7.95.

Lull, David John, *The Spirit in Galatia*. Paul's Interpretation of Pneuma as Divine Power (SBL, Dissertation Series 45). XIII-240 p. 22,7 × 15,4. Chico, CA 1980. Scholars Press. US \$ 9.00.

Luz, Ulrich, Kegler, J., Lampe, P., Hoffman, P. *Eschatologie und Friedenshandeln*. Exegetische Beiträge zur Frage christlicher Friedensverantwortung (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 101). 214 p. 20,7 × 13,5. Stuttgart 1981. Katholisches Bibelwerk. DM 26.80.

Maloney, Elliot C., *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* (SBL, Dissertation Series 51). XVII-311 p. 22,7 × 15,4. Chico, CA 1981. Scholars Press. US \$ 15.00.

Marguerat, Daniel, *Le jugement dans l'Evangile de Matthieu* (Le Monde de la Bible). 598 p. 22,6 × 15. Genève 1981. Labor et Fides.

Pilgrim, Walter E., *Good News to the Poor*. Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts. 198 p. 21,2 × 14,5. Minneapolis 1981. Augsburg Publishing House.

Prigent, Pierre, *L'Apocalypse de Saint Jean* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, Deuxième série XIV). 283 p. 23,8 × 17,3. Lausanne - Paris 1981. Delachaux & Niestlé.

Roloff, Jürgen, *Die Apostelgeschichte übersetzt und erklärt* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 5). 385 p. 24 × 16,5. Göttingen 1981. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. DM 38.

Schröger, Friedrich, *Gemeinde im 1. Petrusbrief*. Untersuchungen zum Selbstverständnis einer christlichen Gemeinde an der Wende vom 1. zum 2. Jahrhundert (Reihe Katholische Theologie, Band 1). XII-268 p. 24,5 × 16,3. Passau 1981. Passavia Universitätsverlag.

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

SCUOLA TIPOGRAFICA S. PIO X - VIA DEGLI ETRUSCHI, 7-9 ROMA - Aprile 1982